OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Catholic Congress,

HELD AT

BALTIMORE, MD.,

November 11th and 12th, 1889.

ALMA COLLEGE
257
LIBRARY
086
Alma, California

WILLIAM H. HUGHES, PUBLISHER
11 ROWLAND STREET,
Detroit Michigan, U. S. A.

Copyright.

3117

Imprimatur,

✠ JOANNES FOLEY,

Ep. Detroitensis.

NOTICE.

The Committee on Finance and Printing authorize this as the Official Report of the Proceedings of the Catholic Congress, held at Baltimore, Md., in November, 1889.

M. W. O'BRIEN, Chairman,
Committee on Finance and Printing.

Detroit, December 16, 1889.

Copyright, 1889, by WILLIAM H. HUGHES.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introduction	v
Call for a Congress	xi
The Catholic Congress	1
Archbishop Gross's Sermon	2
Officers of the Congress	3
The Chairman's Address	7
Count Albert De Mun's Letter	8
Count Waldbott's Letter	9
Hon. Daniel Dougherty's Address	10
Father Nugent's Address	13
Hon. Francis Kernan's Address	14
The Address of Cardinal Gibbons	15
Conclusion of Hon. Francis Kernan's Address	16
The Committee on Resolutions	17
Catholic Congresses. By John Gilmary Shea, LL.D	18
Lay Action in the Church. By Henry F. Brownson, LL.D	25
The Independence of the Holy See. By Charles J. Bonaparte	32
Carroll as a Statesman. Honorie Mercier	40
The New Social Order. By Peter L. Foy	47
Education. By Edmund F. Dunne, LL.D	69
The Catholic Periodical Press. By G. D. Wolff, LL.D	81
Mr. McGloin's Paper	98
Milton E. Smith's Address	101
Mr. Kelly's Paper	103
Mayor Latrobe's Address	113
Societies. By Hon. H. J. Spaunhorst	114
Memorial of the National Union of Catholic Young Men's Societies	120
Young Men's Catholic Societies. By E. McGannon	122
Resolutions	126
Catholic American Literature. By Condé B. Pallen, Ph.D	130
Temperance. By John H. Campbell	142
Sunday Observance. By Manly Tello	148
Labor and Capital. By Wm. Richards	152
What Catholics have Done in the Last Hundred Years. By Richard H. Clarke, LL. D	164
Church Music. By Prof. Heman Allen, A. M	177
An International Congress	186
Archbishop Ireland's Address	187
Cardinal Moran's Letter	188
List of Delegates	189

INTRODUCTION.

The American Catholic Congress, held in Baltimore, Nov. 11–12, 1889, in connection with the memorable Catholic Centenary, of which it was a notable part, attracted a degree of attention from the press and the public not usually commanded by religious or denominational conventions in the United States. Much of this interest, doubtless, was due to the circumstances and conditions under which the congress was convened — to the religious, historical and local associations connected with the centenary celebration in Baltimore, and to the remarkable assemblage of bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries of every rank and order, headed by the much beloved "American Cardinal," including also the distinguished Cardinal Taschereau and his associates of the Canadian and British American hierarchy, as well as representatives from Mexico, Central America, England, Ireland, and Rome. The impressive ceremonies and the majestic pomp of the religious solemnities Sunday, Nov. 10; the powerful and strikingly eloquent orations delivered on the occasion by the Archbishops of Philadelphia and Saint Paul, combined to intensify the enthusiasm of the assembled thousands, and to increase the public interest in the celebration. Redoubled attention was thus naturally drawn to the congress of the Catholic laity.

As usual, too, there was much and wide misapprehension on the part of the non-Catholic public, as to the scope and purpose of the congress, which the simplest knowledge of the relations of the Catholic layman to his church, or even a casual reading of the published "call" would have sufficed to dispel. The congress was not convened for the purpose of "reforming" the church, or to make new laws for the laity. Neither was there any intention of propos-

ing a change in the relations between the clergy and the laity. Of course not. For the first time in the United States a general congress of American Catholic laymen was called together to counsel and deliberate upon subjects and affairs of common Catholic interest, and for the mutual social benefits to be derived from the intercourse and opportunities afforded by such a meeting. The conditions under which the congress assembled happily exempted it from sectional, race and local influences. The programme was broad and generous. It was designed to be an *American Catholic Congress*, and it fulfilled that promise exactly. As a friendly reviewer aptly testifies: "The congress has not only centred the attention of the Catholic world on our loving, yes, passionate, loyalty to Catholic doctrine, morals and practice; on our attachment to those liberties, not modern but Christian, that we have nourished here from the beginning; on our keen sense of the world problems of the day, and of the part we are to play in their solution. It has more than all opened the minds of clerics and laymen to the fact that we have been writing a chapter in the history of the church."

The American Catholic Congress convened under the highest ecclesiastical sanction and approval. It was a representative body, and included all classes and nationalities embraced in the Catholic Church in the United States — assembling as American Catholic laymen.

The deliberations of such a convention and its declarations on the subjects and matters appropriately coming within the limit of its consideration might justly be regarded as fairly indicative of the spirit and principles animating the Catholic laity of the United States.

There was no equivocation or uncertainty in that regard. There was no division of sentiment on any question of principle— there could be none in a Catholic congress on any question of faith.

The congress was devotedly Catholic — it was loyally American. In the declaration of principles put forth as the "platform" of the congress, and which was adopted with enthusiastic unanimity, these characteristics were strikingly and significantly unmistakable.

The papers read expressed the views of the individual writers on the several subjects presented. The "platform," or address, voiced the sentiments and convictions of the congress.

It is true, there was scarcely opportunity for debate or discussion on the papers, or even on the address itself; and the proceedings were characterized from the beginning to the end by a degree of haste scarcely comporting with the deliberation to be looked for on an occa-

sion and in an assemblage so gravely important. But this difficulty and embarrassment could scarcely have been prevented unless by prolonging the congress beyond the two days' limit fixed for its sessions, and this for obvious reasons was impracticable. Even as it was, several important papers that appear in the printed proceedings were not, in fact, read at the congress, greatly to the regret, not so much of the distinguished authors, as of the congress, and especially of the committee which had invited their preparation and arranged for their presentation. Whatever might be said as to the lack of opportunity for discussion, and the regretted omission of the papers in question, there could be no doubt as to the temper and disposition of the congress regarding the different subjects under consideration.

The speeches and addresses were of unusual merit, pregnant in matter, elevated in tone, eloquent and inspiring in delivery, as was strikingly demonstrated by the enthusiastic demonstrations of applause on the part of the audience in several notable instances.

The papers were likewise listened to with the closest attention, and the forcible points and eloquent passages in each invariably won prompt and discriminating recognition.

From the opening "call to order" down to the final adjournment — throughout the two days' session — there was not a single note of discord; dignity, harmony and good feeling characterized the sessions of the congress from the opening to the close. As a member declared when the last word had been spoken, "Thank God, there is not a blemish on its record." The *personnel* of the congress was also remarkable, as acknowledged by the correspondents of the leading journals in alluding to the fact — all agreeing that in point of intelligence, personal character, and business and public position, the delegates to the American Catholic Congress could rank with the members of any representative body ever before assembled in the United States.

It was, in truth, a remarkable assemblage. Brought together from all parts of the Union, there were to be seen on the floor or on the platform men whose names were widely known and whose high character and personal worth were universally acknowledged. Judges, generals, senators, congressmen, editors, bankers, lawyers, manufacturers, managers of railroads, public officials, college students, literary and scientific notables;— and, mingling with these as welcome and honored guests and participants, were cardinals, archbishops and bishops; priests in great numbers, the superiors of religious orders, directors of colleges and seminaries.

Not a few were there whose ancestors landed with the "Pilgrims" at Plymouth Rock, and others who could proudly recall the services and sacrifices of their progenitors in the American revolution The congress was cosmopolitan also. Representatives of every race and nationality known in our American population met there in harmonious fellowship. Irish, German, French, Spaniards, Poles, Bohemians, Austrians, Italians, Belgians, Hollanders or Flemings — and there were delegates of the colored race, as well as of the Indian tribes. Nor could a happier choice of a presiding officer have well been made than was found in the distinguished gentleman whose dignity of manner and impressive eloquence of speech exercised so happy an influence over the congress, to which the historic and patriotic memories and associations attaching to his honored name combined to lend a special charm and interest.

The project of a Catholic Congress in the United States was not new. The suggestion had been put forth on different occasions in various Catholic journals and periodicals, growing naturally out of the action taken and the important results achieved by the Catholic lay congresses held in Europe in recent years. A congress of English-speaking Catholics, to be held in London, was proposed by Cardinal Manning several years ago. The suggestion met with ready response in America, and had the design been carried out the Catholics of the United States would assuredly have been represented on the occasion; but the project did not pass beyond the stage of discussion in the public journals. The subsequent alternative of a Catholic Congress in the United States, to which Cardinal Manning should be invited, was talked of, but was not pressed.

The projectors and organizers of the recent congress happily fixed on a propitious time and place for the meeting, and were enabled to enlist powerful favoring influences in its support. It is no disparagement to the initiative and the independence of the congress to admit that its success was in chief measure due to the authoritative and cordial sanction of Cardinal Gibbons, as well as to the hearty and energetic coöperation given by Archbishop Ireland and by other well known members of the hierarchy, in the preliminary work of organization, etc.

The friendly and active interest taken in the movement by His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons was made conspicuously manifest during the sessions of the congress, from the opening religious services in his cathedral down to the hour of the final adjournment.

His eminence, moreover, secured for the congress the special favor and recognition of the Holy Father's blessing, which was

announced and read amid enthusiastic demonstrations, after the congress had been "called to order."

And this distinguished testimony of regard has, since the adjournment of the congress, been supplemented by the following gratifying proof of the favor with which the work of the congress has been received in Rome:

ROME, Jan. 13, 1890.

"JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS, ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE:

"*Your Eminence.*—'Having made known to the Holy Father the contents of your esteemed favor of the 15th of last December, I now discharge the agreeable duty of informing you that his holiness experienced the liveliest satisfaction at everything done in connection with the Catholic Congress held lately in your city with a grandeur that rendered it worthy of a people universally admired for their energy and civil progress.

"His holiness also spoke of yourself in terms of the highest praise for all you did on that occasion, and said at the same time that he approves most fully of the prudent line of conduct you pursue in your management of every work undertaken to promote the greater development of your young and illustrious church. I must also add that the Holy Father has shown himself most truly grateful for the exceedingly cordial welcome extended by you to his envoy, Mgr. Satolli, and for the delicate attention shown him during his entire stay.

"In conclusion, while thanking your eminence on my own part for the kind expressions toward myself contained in your letter, and assuring you at the same time of the great pleasure it would afford me to render you any service in my power, I beg to remain your most obedient servant. M. CARD. RAMPOLLA."

The action of the congress, thus approved by the illustrious Pope Leo XIII, can receive no more authoritative sanction and requires no higher confirmation.

The most sanguine hopes of the projectors and of the participants have been more than realized.

It now becomes a duty to provide for the next congress, which is to be held in 1892. A committee on future congress will have the matter in charge, and we may hope that proper steps will be taken by this committee at an early day to initiate the necessary preliminaries. Naturally the next congress will have to be organized on broader lines, with more precise plans and with a more definite and satisfactory method of representation. The experience gained by the first congress will enable the committee to proceed

with greater confidence, and while keeping within strict lines, to greatly extend the scope of usefulness possible to such a meeting.

In all likelihood the project of an international or world's Catholic congress will meet with favor, and so soon as the place for holding the great Columbus Exposition or World's Fair shall have been definitively settled, the Catholic congress committee will find it expedient to take up the work assigned to its members.

The next American or world's Catholic congress will be looked forward to with eager and welcome expectation by Catholics. The way is clear, the auguries favoring.

We may then, under happy auspices look for a memorable gathering from all parts of America—wider still, from all parts of the world — Catholics of every nation, race and color, speaking divers languages and dialects, but all united in faith, all of one heart and one mind in devotion and fidelity to Catholic truth and Catholic principles.

WILLIAM J. ONAHAN.

CHICAGO, January, 1890.

CALL FOR THE CONGRESS.

To the Catholics of the United States:

THE CENTENNIAL Anniversary of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy of the United States, which is to be celebrated with befitting pomp and ceremony under happy auspices in Baltimore, next November, may naturally be expected to bring together an imposing assemblage of the hierarchy and clergy, as well as a large concourse of the Catholic laity, who will be eager to take part in an event so interesting in itself, and so impressive and suggestive in its religious and historic significance.

That the Catholic laymen of the United States should hold, at the same time and place, a general meeting or congress would seem most appropriate. When the suggestion of such a meeting was happily conceived and put forth, it was everywhere met with expressions of warm approval. It was felt that a congress of the Catholics of the United States, called without reference to national or local lines, on a broad and generous platform, could not fail to be productive of good results.

It would demonstrate the union of the entire Catholic body in all that concerns the principles of our holy religion; the harmony, mutual attachment, and good will subsisting among the different orders in the church—the hierarchy, the clergy, and the laity—and it would moreover afford an opportunity to test in a public manner, the loyalty of the Catholics of the United States to the constitution and laws of the land, to which they have invariably been loyal in the past, and may, with equal confidence, be relied on to be faithful and devoted in the future. The advantages of such a meeting then being apparent, and its opportuneness most evident, there was only required the sanction of authority to justify the call for a general congress of the Catholics of the United States.

We are happy to say the project of this congress has the approval of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, and of other archbishops and bishops.

The preliminaries have been arranged, and the congress is now accordingly called to meet in the city of Baltimore, Monday, November 11, at 10 o'clock A. M. It is expected that the sessions

will continue during two days. The local arrangements for the congress are in charge of a committee of Baltimore gentlemen.

The principal subjects for consideration and discussion have been substantially agreed on, and capable gentlemen have been invited to read papers before the congress on the topics proposed to them. General discussion of these questions will be invited, and the titles of the several papers will be duly announced beforehand. The congress is intended to be free and open to all Catholics

To provide for due order and so that necessary regulations shall prevail, as well as for the purpose of insuring general representation from all parts of the country, it has been decided by the committee in charge, to issue cards of admission to the floor of the hall, which cards will entitle the person named thereon to the full privileges of the congress. These cards will be placed in the hands of the bishop or administrator of each diocese. Catholics who desire to attend the congress will make application accordingly to the ordinary of their diocese for the necessary introduction.

Coincidently with the celebration of the Catholic centennial and the meeting of the Catholic congress, will occur the formal opening of the Catholic University of America, at Washington, an institution in which the Catholic laity of the United States feel the deepest concern, and to the future of which they look with hope and pride. This event would in itself be of sufficient general importance to bring together a large number of leading Catholic laymen, who have already signally demonstrated their interest in this great undertaking.

The meeting of the Catholic congress, therefore, under the conditions proposed, will be seen to be in every respect timely. The result of the meeting and the effect of the deliberations and discussions cannot but prove most useful and beneficial in every respect.

The people of the United States lately celebrated by appropriate religious and public services, amid universal rejoicing, the centenary of the formal establishment of our free government. Catholics justly shared in the general joy, as they have likewise participated in the advantages our admirable constitution guarantees to all citizens, especially the precious boon of civil and religious liberty, the seed of which was first planted and nourished in "Catholic Maryland."

With eminent fitness, therefore, may we now call our Catholic brethren together to join in celebrating another anniversary of exceptional interest; to recall the memory of the devoted and patriotic bishop whose zeal for religion and love of liberty have won for his memory the respect and admiration of every American; to testify

the unity of their religious faith, their steadfast adherence to true principles, and their unwavering attachment to the constitution and laws of this free and prosperous country.

[Signed] WILLIAM J. ONAHAN, Chicago, *Chairman*,
HENRY J. SPAUNHORST, St. Louis,
Chicago July 31, 1889. DANIEL A. RUDD, Cincinnati,
Committee on Organization of the Catholic Congress.

HENRY F. BROWNSON, Detroit.
M. W. O'BRIEN, "
JOSEPH B. MOORE, "
WILLIAM H. HUGHES, "
JOHN HYDE, "
J. P. FLEITZ, "
PETER L. FOY, St. Louis.
LOUIS FUSZ, "
MAURICE F. EGAN, Notre Dame.
CHAS. A. HARDY, Philadelphia.
PATRICK DONAHOE, Boston.
THOS. DWIGHT, M. D., "
CHAS. F. DONNELLY, "
HASKET DERBY, "
GEORGE W. SMITH, Chicago.
W. P. REND, "
PETER KIOLBASSA, "
JAMES ARMSTRONG, "
T. J. SEMMES, New Orleans.
WILLIAM L. KELLY, St. Paul.
HENRY L. HOGUET, New York.
EUGENE KELLY, "
JOHN D. KEILEY, JR., "
PATRICK FARRELLY, "
JOHN GILMARY SHEA, "
LOUIS BENZIGER, "
LAWRENCE KEHOE, "
LOUIS ERNST, "
PATRICK POLAND, Cincinnati.
C. A. MUELLER, Cleveland.
JOSEPH RANFT, "
MANLY TELLO, "
M. J. HARSON, Providence.
MARTIN NEUHAEUSEL, Toledo.
EDWARD O'NEIL, Milwaukee.
JAMES H. DORMER, Buffalo.
JOHN LAWLER, Prairie du Chien.
CHAS. J. BONAPARTE, Baltimore.
DANIEL J. FOLEY, "
JOHN A. CREIGHTON, Omaha.

The Catholic Congress

HELD IN BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, NOVEMBER 11 AND 12, 1889.

BEGINNING with Solemn Pontifical Mass Monday at the cathedral and concluding with the brilliant torch light parade Tuesday night, the first Catholic congress in the United States was most successful, and the interest and enthusiasm shown by all the participants gave augury of great results. At the Mass the celebrant was the Most Rev. Archbishop Corrigan, of New York; assistant priest, Mgr. A. J. Donnelly, V. G., of New York; deacon, the Rev. M. J. McBride, of the cathedral, Harrisburg, Pa.; sub-deacon, the Rev. Hugh Roe O'Donnell, of St. Mary Star of the Sea, East Boston, Mass.; master of ceremonies, the Rev. J. A. McCallen, of St. Patrick's, Montreal; assistants, the Rev. Henry C. Grady, and Seminarian James Nolen; thurifer, the Rev. John J. Dennison; crucifer, the Rev. Robert E. O'Kane, and acolytes, Messrs. Ramm and Gorey. Cardinal Gibbons was attended by Rt. Rev. Mgr. Boff, V. G., of Cleveland, and Rev. M. J. Lavelle, of New York; and Cardinal Taschereau by Rt. Rev. Mgri. Windthorst and Marios. The music included Gounod's *Messe Solennelle* and Diabelli's *Gaudeamus*.

After the Mass Archbishop Gross, of Oregon, delivered the address of welcome to the delegates, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP GROSS'S SERMON.

Your Eminences, Most Reverend, Right Reverend, Reverend Fathers, and Dearly Beloved Brethren:—Upon me has fallen the pleasant duty of welcoming the delegates to our Catholic congress. I am happy to see it in my native city, Baltimore. A son is always proud when another gem is inserted in the wreath on his mother's brow—proud to show to the world outside the links of union that unite the hearts of the people and clergy; and it should be so, first of all, for our mutual interest. Our faith should be as dear to the people as to us, and the people have shown this by their willingness to make any sacrifice rather than surrender their faith. When the yellow fever desolated the land, the people and the priests imperiled,

and even sacrificed, their lives. This union of the people and clergy is good and necessary. The history of the past has shown it. When the Turks threatened all of Europe, the Pope and bishops aroused the people in their congresses and drove back the tide of Turkish barbarism. This is an opportune time for the congress, when standing at the end of the first century of the existence of the church in the United States, and while we acknowledge what great and glorious work has been done during the past hundred years, we can learn wisdom from mistakes and losses owing to human frailty that have been inflicted upon the church. You must acknowledge that our institutions are young, and therefore need a fostering care. You must also remember that there are great questions to be solved; there are dangers ahead, and there are great evils afflicting society. You must remember that we have three great enemies — the devil, the world, and the flesh. We believe in the existence of the devil. He is an angel, though fallen, and possesses all the wonderful powers of his angelic nature. He hates us, and hates God, and goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. We have to fear the world, with its corrupt maxims and principles. We also know that there are some who, either ignorantly or maliciously, are enemies of the Catholic Church. The Know-Nothing party, and others, showed us that there are some who would deprive the church of its liberties, if possible. England had been Catholic for one thousand years. Her long line of saints and holy personages showed how the church flourished in England. But the hour of trial came. Evils had grown up; the servants were asleep. Watch, therefore; be up and doing.

You who may be citizens by adoption love the country which you have chosen, and to which you have sworn allegiance; and, as for us, ask the child if he loves the mother who gave him life, and upon whose bosom he slept.

She is a grand country, extending from the broad Atlantic to where the Pacific washes the golden shores of California. She carries on her bosom flowers and fruits of every clime, and hides beneath her surface gold, silver, and other ores; but richer than her agricultural wealth, grander than her mines of gold and silver, is her splendid political constitution and government—in our humble opinion, the grandest the world has ever seen. And these sacred institutions we would guard and perpetuate. You assemble in a place well fitted for such a congress, which calls to mind the deeds of our fathers. When we stand upon the ground the Cathedral occupies, we remember that it was here the gallant French soldiers encamped on their return from the capture of Yorktown. When we enter, the very walls seem hallowed by the scenes they have witnessed. Here an England, here a Kenrick shone in his wisdom and holiness. Here were assembled their great councils which have done so much for the church of America. *Vigilate et orate.* You follow the other advice of our Lord by beginning your deliberations by prayer in assisting at the mass just offered. Let me also call to your mind that on the coat-of-arms of the first American bishopric have always been the words *Auspice Maria.* The Catholics have

ever looked to the Virgin Mother of Christ. They gave this state the name of Mary's land, and named the first settlement St. Mary's, and this first cathedral has been dedicated to this glorious Queen of heaven and earth. It was a privilege of Mary to protect and guard the infant Jesus, and she has protected and guarded the infant church of this United States. Mary was ever true to Jesus. When all had abandoned Him she faithfully remained at the foot of the cross, and may the same Virgin Mother watch over this young church, guard and protect its existence.

At the conclusion of the mass the delegates assembled at the Concordia Opera House and began their sessions, which continued in a most harmonious manner for two days. Enthusiasm was rampant, and whether it was some striking point in an address or the entrance of some well known person, hats were waved and the audience rose in a mighty mass. Men were there well known to the country or to their different sections—about 1,500 delegates from the various dioceses in the United States; men by birth or descent of many nationalities, including Indians and negroes all sitting in perfect harmony, and with one common purpos

On the stage were the president of the congress, Ex-Gov. John Lee Carroll of Maryland.

The Secretaries: George E. Hamilton, LL. D., Georgetown College, D. C.; Prof. J. F. Edwards, Notre Dame University, Ind.; Dr. Wm. S. MacDonald, Boston College, Boston, Mass.; J. B. Fisher, Immaculate Conception College, New Orleans, La.; Amedée Reyburn, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.; John M. Duffy, Chicago, Ill.

The Vice-Presidents: John S. Prince, St. Paul, Minn.; Louis Fusz, St. Louis, Mo.; Hon. Wm. Walsh, Hon. Chas. B. Roberts, Michael Jenkins, Baltimore, Md.; Edward McGannon, Philemon B. Ewing, Columbus, O.; Eugene Kelly, Frederic R. Coudert, Henry L. Hoguet, John D. Crimmins, New York, N. Y.; James W. Bryan, Covington, Ky.; John A. McShane, Omaha, Neb.; Thomas Corcoran, Manchester, N. H.; J. Smith Brennan, Wilmington, Del.; Daniel Dougherty, Louisville, Ky.; M. W. O'Brien, Detroit, Mich.; James David Coleman, Hon. Frank McGloin, John T. Gibbons, New Orleans, La.; Wm. P. Breen, Fort Wayne, Ind.; John B. Riley, Ogdensburg, N. Y.; Patrick Farrelly, Newark, N. J.; Dr. John B. Hanrahan, Burlington, Vt.; Hon. A. C. Campbell, Wyoming, W. T.; J. B. Wise, Alton, Ill.; Gen. Geo. W. Smith, Gen. M. R. Morgan, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. M. J. Condon, Hon. M. Burns, Nashville, Tenn.; Chas. Lautz, John McManus, Buffalo, N. Y.; Hon. John Lawler, La Crosse, Wis.; Major B. J. Reid, Erie, Pa.; Stephen Farrelly, Hon. Daniel Dougherty, Chas. A. Hardy, Philadelphia, Pa.; James Phelan A. F. Keating, Pittsburgh and Alle-

gheny; Alfred H. Chappell, Hartford, Conn.; Bart E. Linehan, Dubuque, Ia.; Hon. John E. Kenna, Wheeling, W. Va.; Jas. McMahon, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Hon. John Killian, Grand Rapids, Mich.; F. C. Brent, Mobile, Ala.; John Lillis, Davenport, Ia.; John A. O'Reilly, Nicholas E. Kernan, Syracuse, N. Y.; Hon. Chas. Tracey, Albany, N. Y.; James Flanagan, Boise City, Idaho; C. F. Donnelly, Boston, Mass.; Alex J. McCone, Sacramento, Cal.; Judge J. M. Gibbons, Salt Lake City, Utah; J. Carroll Payne, Atlanta, Ga.; Hon. Michael Reis, Belleville, Ill.; Hon. Francis Burke, George Korbly, Vincennes, Ind.; Patrick Poland, Col. Donn Piatt, Cincinnati, O.; Dr. Albert Letourneaux, Concordia, Kan.; Hon. D. W. Carroll, Little Rock, Ark.; Michael G. Munly, Portland, Ore.; D. Wall, Vancouver, Wash.; Wm. L. McLaughlin, Sioux Falls, Dak.; Hon. F. W. Gunster, Hon. John F. Connolly, Hon. John E. Barrett, Scranton, Pa.; T. J. McDonnell, Cleveland, O.; J. Z. H. Scott, Dr. C. H. Wilkinson, Galveston, Tex.; Chas. J. McCarthy, Portland, Me.; Geo. W. Young, Natchez, Miss.; Wm. A. Daffron, Richmond, Va.; Jos. D. Banigan, Providence, R. I.; John O'Flanagan, Leavenworth, Kan.

The Committee on Organization: Hon. William J. Onahan, LL.D., Chairman, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. Henry J. Spaunhorst, St. Louis, Mo.; Daniel A. Rudd, Cin., O.; John D. Keiley, Jr., New York; John Gilmary Shea, LL. D., Elizabeth, N. J.; John M. Duffy, Secretary.

The Committee on Papers: Henry F. Brownson, LL. D., Chairman, Detroit, Mich.; Peter L. Foy, St. Louis, Mo.; M. J. Harson, Providence, R. I.

Advisory Committee: Most Rev. John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul, Chairman; Rt. Rev. John S. Foley, Bishop of Detroit; Rt. Rev. Richard Gilmour, Bishop of Cleveland; Rt. Rev. S. V. Ryan, Bishop of Buffalo; Rt. Rev. C. P. Maes, Bishop of Covington; Rt. Rev. Matth. Harkins, Bishop of Providence.

Committee on Finance and Printing: M. W. O'Brien, Chairman, Detroit, Mich.; John Byrne, Jr., New York; Charles A. Mair, Chicago; C. C. Schriver, Baltimore; F. A. Drew, St. Louis.

Besides these were at different times, Rev. E. A. Higgins, president St. Ignatius College, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. J. Havens Richards, S. J., president of the Georgetown (D. C.) University; Rev. P. Corrigan, Hoboken, N. J.; Rev. Dr. S. J. Smith, S. J., president of Loyola College, Baltimore; Hon. M. J. Power, speaker of the Nova Scotia Legislative Assembly; Rev. Thaddeus Hogan, Trenton, N. J.; Rev. Charles J. Giese, Millville, N. J.; Rev. M. J. Fitzgerald, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; Archbishop

Williams, of Boston; Hon. Wm. J. O'Brien, of Baltimore; Hon. Honoré Mercier, of Quebec; Mgr. Joos, Vicar-General, Monroe, Mich.; Bishop Rademacher, of Nashville, Tenn.; Bishop Wigger, of Newark; Charles McCarthy, Jr., of Portland, Me.; Mgr. J. De Concilio, of Jersey City; Rev. B. J. Keiley, Vicar-General of the diocese of Savannah, Ga.; Bishop Brondel, of Helena; Rev. M. J. Brophy, of New York; Bishop James McGolrick; of Duluth; Very Rev. O. P. Ludden, of Little Falls, N. Y.; Rev. James Ludden, of Albany, N. Y.; Mgr. Windthorst, of Chillicothe, O.; James O'Reilly, of York, Pa.; Bishop James Ryan, of Alton; Mgr. Louis G. Deppen, of Louisville, Ky.; Bishop Denis M. Bradley, of Manchester, N. H.; Rev. S. B. Smith, of Paterson, N. J.; V. Rev. Edward Sorin, of Notre Dame, Ind., General of the Congregation of the Holy Cross; Bishop Thomas McGovern, of Harrisburg; Rev. Dr. C. A. Oliver, Scranton, Miss.; Bishop E. P. Wadhams, of Ogdensburg, N. Y.; Bishop John Moore, of St. Augustine, Fla.; Rev. R. Brady, S. J.; Rev. Francis M. Hencaid, Minister Provincial of the Franciscans, Syracuse, N. Y.; Bishop K. C. Flasch, of La Crosse; ex-Mayor Grace, of New York; Rev. Austin Heyburn, San Luis Potosi, Mexico; Bishop Curtis, of Wilmington; Archbishop Elder, of Cincinnati; Bishop John Loughlin, of Brooklyn; Bishop McIntyre, of Prince Edward's Island; Bishop Zardetti, of St. Cloud; Rev. J. Nugent, of Liverpool; Archbishop M. A. Corrigan, of New York; Archbishop P. J. Ryan, of Philadelphia, and many other men distinguished in the church or state.

FIRST DAY.

The proceedings of the American Catholic Congress were formally opened at 11 o'clock by the Hon. William J. Onahan, chairman of the Committee on Preliminary Organization, who called the congress to order, and then invited the Most Rev. Archbishop Ireland to invoke the divine blessing on the congress and its deliberations.

After a prayer by the archbishop, Mr. Onahan announced the receipt of a cablegram from the Holy Father, the illustrious Pope Leo XIII, in response to a message sent to His Holiness, in the name of the congress. The announcement was received with cheers, which were repeated again and again on the reading of the cablegram, which was in the following terms:

"His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, Baltimore. Having made known to the Holy Father, the expression of devotion conveyed to him on the part of the Catholic Congress to be held in Baltimore, his Holiness graciously bids me say that he most affectionately im-

parts his blessing to all the members. M. Card. Rampolla." (Applause.)

When the applause was over, Mr. Onahan welcomed, in the name of the congress the distinguished ecclesiastics and laymen who were in attendance as guests of the congress, expressing the hope that an international congress of the Catholic laity would be convened in the United States in the near future, in which all present might have the happiness to participate.

Mr. Onahan then, in a brief address, nominated Hon. John Lee Carroll, of Maryland, as the temporary president of the congress. The address and nomination received great applause. On being introduced to the congress, Governor Carroll said:

THE CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS.

Your Eminence, Most Reverend Prelates, and Gentlemen of the Catholic Laity: The meeting in this city of the first congress of Catholic laymen which has ever assembled in the United States, cannot fail to be an event of the sincerest interest to all who have the welfare of the Catholic Church at heart. It was here that practically in the United States, the church was founded. It was here that the organization took place through which Archbishop Carroll was invested with the purple. It was here that the basis was laid of that prosperity which to-day is the greatest source of our pride, and which promises to go hand in hand with the increasing wealth and abundance which is showered upon every portion of our land.

It would seem, therefore, to be eminently proper that we, the laymen of the church, should meet upon this hallowed ground, and renew our allegiance to the doctrines we profess; that we should show to our fellow-countrymen the true relations that exist between the church that we obey and love, and the government of our choice; that we should proclaim that unity of sentiment upon all subjects presented to us, which has ever been the source of Catholic strength, and that, in a spirit of perfect charity toward every denomination, we should freely exchange our views in relation to all matters which affect us as members of the Catholic Church.

It may be that the question will be asked: By what authority is this congress held, and under what law does it assemble? In reply to this we would suggest, by the sanction of His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, and the distinguished prelates who now surround us, and by virtue of the authority of the constitution of the United States.

When the first amendment to the constitution declared "That congress shall pass no law respecting the establishment of a religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof," the keynote of our future prosperity was sounded, and to-day religious liberty would be defended by all denominations as zealously as they would trample upon any attempt to abridge the personal freedom of the citizen. In fact, we have only to look back to the history of the

early colonists of Maryland to find that when persecution for religious opinion was sanctioned by the laws of the mother country, when Puritan and Episcopalian were arrayed against each other, the Catholic colony of Maryland proclaimed that, hereafter, upon her soil, religion was ever to be as free as the air we breathe, and that loyalty to our country's government could be confined to no sect or class of our citizens.

Armed, then, with this authority, and proud of our record upon every subject which can affect the freedom of the American people, we have gathered here in a spirit of social unity, to listen to the words of those who will disclose to us the wants of the Catholic layman, and who will make suggestions to meet the future growth and the temporal necessities of the church.

How truly may we say that the American Catholic has been associated with every period of success or suffering through which our fathers passed! From the early days of the revolution, when Archbishop Carroll was sent to Canada to seek the sympathy or to enlist the active support of our northern neighbors, along through the years when Chief Justice Taney graced the ermine, or Sheridan bore his country's flag, the American Catholic has ever been foremost among those whose memory will be recalled for daring in the field or for wisdom in the council.

It is not, however, the individual Catholic alone who has always emphasized his devotion to his country, and to the institutions under which we live. The church as a power has never failed to throw her influence in the scale of law and order, when called upon to ward off the dangers which convulsion brings upon the state. The disturbing element of socialism would perhaps to-day have held a stronger footing upon the continents of Europe and America, had it not been checked in the outset by the powerful and unswerving condemnation of the Holy See.

The wild theory that "property is robbery." and that the regulations of law and order must be overturned, was met by Leo XIII with a calm and solemn protest, which came like a voice from heaven to still the passions of mankind. Little did it matter to His Holiness that his own traditional possessions had been rudely assailed and wrested from him; a high duty had to be performed by the spiritual head of the church, and the lovers of good government, and of law and order everywhere, received the benefit of his wise inspirations and the blessings of his peaceful command.

And yet, while the church has always thus maintained respect for established order, and has fearlessly upheld the rights of the sovereign power, she has ever been prepared to lavish upon the suffering masses that tenderness and sympathy which has enabled her to possess the affections and to rule the conduct of the multitudes.

When the question arose in our country whether the church should condemn as a body certain organizations of the laboring class, it was our own cardinal archbishop, whose masterly review of the situation, poured oil upon the troubled waters, and satisfied the Holy See that the American laborer was still within the influence of the ministers of religion. Listen to his memorable words in

this connection: "Among all the glorious titles which the church's history has deserved for her, there is not one which at present gives her such great influence as that of the 'friend of the people.' Assuredly in our democratic country it is this title which wins for the Catholic Church not only the enthusiastic devotedness of millions of her children, but also the respect and admiration of all our citizens, whatever be their religious belief. It is the power of this title which renders persecution almost an impossibility, and which draws toward our Holy Church the great heart of the American people."

Thus we see that this vast organization, of which we are proud to enroll ourselves as members, is at once conspicuous for three great qualities, which appeal distinctly to the American public:

1. That its followers have ever been in perfect harmony with the spirit and principles of our revolution.

2. That the power of the church can always be relied upon to maintain conservative authority, and to condemn the theory and practice of those who would destroy the landmarks of society.

3. That she always stands with outstretched arms to aid the suffering masses, and is known throughout the Christian world by the glorious title of the "friend of the people."

Who, then, can wonder at her astounding progress in this land of freedom? Who can wonder at the wide and far-reaching influence of her priests and bishops, when they unite with their sacred character the best and highest qualities of the citizen?

Who can estimate the strength and value to a nation of the united action of a body of men who are guided by the influences of charity and religion?

It is not a part of my duty in the position with which you have honored me, to lay before you further the plans and purposes of this assemblage. This will be better done by those more familiar with the subject. I may, however, well remind you, that with the vast interests of the Catholic Church, in every portion of our land, with millions of our countrymen professing her faith, the time has come when her laymen will rejoice at the opportunity of meeting each other upon common ground, and of exchanging views upon subjects of vital importance to us all. Let us hope that this congress, so auspiciously begun, in this illustrious presence, will be but the forerunner of others yet to come; that the Catholic will look to its meeting with pride and satisfaction; will feel convinced that we have but two great purposes at heart, the glory and progress of the Catholic Church, and the continued prosperity of the American people. (Applause.)

Mr. Onahan then read two letters addressed to the congress from across the Atlantic. The first, from Count Albert de Mun, is as follows:

CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES, PARIS, October 3, 1889.

My Dear Mr. Onahan:—You will excuse my writing to you in French; I feared if I did so in English it would be very incorrect.

I have received, with a great feeling of gratitude, the invitation that you addressed to me through the Committee on Organization of

the Catholic congress of Baltimore, the terms of which have greatly touched me. I would have been happy to respond to them and to carry before the Catholics of the United States an expression of the sentiments of affectionate fraternity with which my friends and myself are penetrated for them, and to take example by their zeal, their organization, and their independence.

I admire most sincerely the magnificent development of the Catholic movement in America. I have watched with much interest the social action exercised in favor of the people by the bishops of your country. I have treasured also a deep recollection of my meeting with His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons and their lordships the bishops of St. Paul and of Richmond since their last journey through France, for I was drawn to them by an ardent sympathy with their works and their labors.

The present state of my health and the numerous occupations that are imposed upon me do not permit me, unhappily, to undertake, at so brief notice, the voyage to America. I regret it very deeply, and I pray you to be before the members of the congress, the interpreter of my thanks for their invitation and of the wish that I cherish from the bottom of my heart for the development and the grandeur of the Catholic Church of America and for the prosperity and the happiness of its children.

Dear Mr. Onahan, believe me,

Your very cordially devoted,

A. DE MUN.

The second, from Count Waldbott, of Bassenheim, Belgium, is as follows:

Dear Sir: It would have afforded me the greatest pleasure to assist at your congress had not particular reasons rendered it impossible for me to do so.

For a long time I have been wishing to visit your great country and to study at its source the organization and working of the institutions which have given such a wonderful impetus to your republic. I would have particularly enjoyed celebrating with you the centenary of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States, rejoicing with you at the growing power of the church under the beneficent action of liberty; shaking hands with those valiant champions of our holy cause, and instructing myself by listening to the words of your orators and venerable bishops, especially to your great cardinal of Baltimore, that light of the universal church.

Had I been able to accept your invitation it would have been to me the greatest pleasure to have shown my Christian union with you all, and assert by my presence that spirit of solidarity and international agreement which it is necessary to display, in the most energetic manner possible, in opposition to the very united action of the enemies of good.

Allow me to tell you once more that under those circumstances I am deeply distressed at the obstacles which prevent my being present in your illustrious assembly, but I do not at all give up the hope

of being happier another time and to be able in a future congress to offer you, *viva voce*, the expression of my sympathy, esteem, and admiration for the valiant Catholics of the new world.

I am, sir, yours devotedly in our Lord,

FREDERICK, COUNT WALDBOTT, of Bassenheim,
St. Andreas, near Bruges (Belgium).

OCTOBER 24, 1889.

The chairman appointed the following committees to wait upon His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, and request his attendance upon the congress: Charles F. Prince, of St. Paul; Charles J. Bonaparte, of Baltimore, and Eugene Kelly, of New York.

MR. ONAHAN—"As it will require some time to organize the committees, your Committee on Preliminary Organization thought it wise to invite a few eminent gentlemen to occupy your attention and address you, at the outset of the proceedings of the congress. The first one that I will ask you, Mr. Chairman, to invite to address the congress, is a gentleman widely known to the Catholics of America, who needs no eulogy or introduction from me—the Hon. Daniel Dougherty, of New York." (Applause.)

The appearance of the silver-tongued orator upon the platform was the signal for a warm burst of applause, which was again and again renewed. When quiet was restored Mr. Dougherty said:

MR. DOUGHERTY'S ADDRESS.

I am profoundly touched by this, the honor of my life. (Applause.) This convention is an event in the history of the republic, an era in American progress, an advance in humanity—a move of earth toward heaven. (Applause.)

Called to your presence, theme after theme comes flashing through my brain and swelling in my bosom. A single exultant thought I will give utterance to, and then resume my seat.

We Catholics, Roman Catholics, American Roman Catholics, (applause), proud, high-spirited, and sensitive as any of our countrymen, have silently submitted to wrongs and injustices in manifold shapes from time immemorial. Away back in colonial days Catholics suffered the direst cruelties. Talk of the slaves of the South in ante-war times — why, they were treated like high-bred guests when compared with Catholics in colonial days. It is the "damned spot" that will "not out." The only religious martyrs who ever stained our fair land with life blood were Roman Catholics. Spurned with suspicion, disfranchised, persecuted for opinion's sake, hunted as criminals, and punished with death by infamous laws! We have from time to time been slandered, vilified and maligned in newspapers, pamphlets, and books, in speech and sermon, in sectarian assembly, in political convention, aye, even in the congress of the United States. We have been proscribed at the ballot box. The highest honors of the republic are denied us by a

prejudice that has all the force of a constitutional enactment. In integrity, intellect, and accomplishments the equal of our fellows, yet it is rare that exalted distinctions have been tendered to Roman Catholics. The exercises of our holy religion as a right are denied in many institutions to the sick, the suffering, and the unfortunate, and to criminals in prisons and penitentiaries. Though the rank and file of the army and navy are largely of our creed, yet the number of chaplains can be counted upon the fingers of a single hand. It is said that Catholic Indians have Protestant teachers. Churches have been burned, convents have been pillaged, and libraries have been destroyed. Political parties of the past have sought to deprive us of our political rights; we have been branded as tools of a foreign potentate, and unworthy to enjoy the name of Americans.

At last the hour has come, not through our seeking, but in the course of events, when we, the Roman Catholic laity of the United States, can with propriety speak, can vindicate ourselves, calmly yet firmly, charitably yet proudly conscious of the integrity of our motives and the impregnability of our position. (Applause.)

We assert we are pre-eminently Americans (applause). Had it not been for Catholics and the Catholic Church, there would be no America (applause); the continent would be unknown. It was by Catholics that that liberty which is the essence of all liberty—freedom to worship God—was established here, and by them alone. It was priests, aye, Jesuits, Dominicans—missionaries, who first sought and explored our land, penetrated into the wilderness, tracked the streams and gave sainted names to localities, bays, lakes and rivers. It was the holy sacrifice of the Mass that was the first offering to the true God upon this continent. It was a Catholic nation that came to the rescue of our revolutionary fathers in the war against the greatest of Protestant powers. (Applause.) A signer of the Declaration of Independence was a Catholic. The name of the first archbishop of Baltimore is indissolubly linked with Benjamin Franklin. The Catholic Church has given to the republic heroes in every war, and in every battle on field or flood Catholics have sealed their fidelity with their lives.

We are here to-day, the Roman Catholic laity of the United States to proclaim to all the world that our country is tied to every fibre of our hearts, and no human power can shake our loving allegiance to its constitution and laws. (Applause.)

Truly, the blood of the martyr is the seed of the church. Marvellous as has been the growth of population, Catholics have outstripped all. From forty thousand we have become ten millions. From a despised people, a mighty power. In every avenue of intellect and industry Catholics are the peers of their fellow-men. In every village, steeple or tower tipped with the cross tells where Catholics pray. In every town splendid churches gather each day thousands of worshippers. In every metropolis a cathedral lifts its massive walls high above surrounding piles, or with its stately dome crowns the city's brow. Our grand old Church is the protector of learning. She it was that rescued the priceless jewels of classic lore

from the ruins of the Roman Empire, preserved them during the convulsions of a thousand years and gave them to the printer's art to enrich the learning and adorn the literature of every language to the end of time. (Applause.)

She is the pioneer of civilization. The founder of states, the framer of laws. The champion of the people against the encroachment of tyrants. She it was that struck the chains from the white slaves of Europe. She is the patron of art, the theme of the poet. She guards the home, sanctifies marriage, elevates woman (applause) and places the Blessed Mother nearest to the Saviour. (Applause.) She it is, while striving for the good of mortals here below bends her sublime and heaven-appointed mission to the one supreme aspiration of fitting her children for the regions of eternal bliss. (Applause.)

The shadow of an imposing event begins to move. The people of the United States, aye, of the hemisphere, are about to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America. We heartily rejoice in this resolve. That tremendous event, with reverence I may say the second creation, the finding of a new world, and the vast results that have flowed to humanity, can be traced directly to the Roman Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church alone. Protestantism was unknown when America was discovered. Let the students and the scholars search the archives of Spain, the libraries of Europe, and the deeper the research the more glory will adorn the brow of Catholicity. It was a pious Catholic who conceived the mighty thought. It was when footsore and down-hearted at the porch of a monastery that hope dawned on him. It was a monk who first encouraged him. It was a cardinal who interceded with the sovereigns of Spain. It was a Catholic king who fitted out the ships. It was a Catholic queen who offered her jewels as a pledge. It was the Catholic Columbus and a Catholic crew (applause) that sailed out upon an unknown sea where ship had never sailed before. It was to spread the Catholic faith that the sublime risk was run. It was the hymn to the Blessed Mother that each night closed the perils of the day and inspired with hope the morrow. It was the Holy Cross, the emblem of Catholicity, that was carried to the shore and planted on the new-found world. (Applause.) It was the holy sacrifice of the Mass that was the first, and for a hundred years the only Christian worship on this continent that a Catholic named America.

Why, the broad seal of the Catholic Church is stamped forever upon the four corners of the continent. Let us, therefore, in mind and heart and soul rejoice at the triumphs of our country and glory in our creed. The one gives us constitutional freedom on earth; the other, if faithful to its teachings, secures an eternity in heaven. (Applause long and continued, amid which the speaker retired.)

The thanks of the convention were then tendered to Mr. Dougherty for his remarks.

The Chairmen next introduced the Rev. James Nugent, of Liverpool, who spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman and my Lords and Gentlemen: I feel this a singular privilege to be called before you, more especially to have to stand here after the soul-inspiring words of the Catholic and the orator of America. (Applause.) The ringing words which have come from that Catholic heart I feel have electrified this meeting, and you want no words from a stranger to further occupy your time, but this I will say, that we who have come from the other side of the ocean will carry back with us a lesson, and I trust it will inspire us to catch up your spirit, and make us not afraid to stand up boldly for our rights, remembering that we have a nation behind us—a great Catholic nation that is in sympathy with us and which is one with us not only in creed, but I may say in blood. When the message will be conveyed to our cardinal archbishop no one, I know, will be more in sympathy with the action that is here taking place than he whose whole life is devoted to the interests of the church and the masses of the people. Forgive me if I now let out a secret. The idea of a Catholic congress first sprang from those two great hearts coming together, the cardinal archbishop of Westminster and the noble outspoken archbishop of St. Paul. (Applause.) It was intended that an international congress should be held in London; unfortunately, we are not made of the same bold metal that you are, and we have failed; but I trust the key note that Mr. Onahan has uttered as regards an international convention in the future will bring not only representative men from every country both here and across the Atlantic, but also will bind us closer and closer together in these great social questions that affect the best interests of all our people. (Applause.)

A unanimous vote of thanks was tendered to the Rev. James Nugent for his words of encouragement.

The chairman introduced the Hon. Honoré Mercier, premier of Quebec, who said:

Mr. Chairman, Most Rev. Gentlemen, and Gentlemen: I feel a little embarrassed to speak in English. I am not, I am afraid, master enough of your beautiful language to express my views as I wish to express them, and having received the honor of an invitation—a personal invitation—from the Most Reverend Cardinal Gibbons, I thought it my duty to put a few words in writing, in order to be surer of the expressions that I might use, so if you have no objections, I will delay until this afternoon the reading of the paper I have prepared. (Applause.)

Mr. Onahan announced to the members of the congress, that they will be expected and are invited to attend a reception that His Eminence gives this evening to the distinguished prelates, and also in honor and as a compliment to the congress assembled to-day. The title for admission at the door will be the delegate's badges or delegate's tickets. The reception will be in this hall.

The chairman then introduced the Hon. Francis Kernan, of New York, who spoke as follows:

MR. KERNAN'S SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman, Most Reverend Prelates and Fathers, and you, my Fellow Catholics of the United States of America: I am highly gratified now, at the end of the first century of the organization of our church in the states, to meet so large, so intelligent a representative body of the Roman Catholics of the United States. (Applause.) We meet for no secret purpose, or no mere political purposes, but we meet to associate ourselves together for the purpose of doing great good to us, the laymen of the United States, and also to the government of the United States. (Applause.) We desire, by meeting occasionally and consulting with one another, from all parts of the Union, to benefit ourselves by doing all that we can, by associate and open action, to make the laymen of the United States more thoroughly Catholic in the practice of their religion everywhere. If they practise their religion, they will give the example to our dissenting friends; and I venture to assert that the American people will more truly judge the tree by the fruit, and that if the laity perform their duty, by living up to the teachings of their church, they will discover how much they have been abused by the inculcation of prejudice against them. (Applause.) By doing this we will also make our people more loyal, if they can be, than they are now, to the preservation of the glorious political institutions under which we live. In the land I know there are other views among some of our dissenting brethren, but I say to them in private, and I say it here in public, that the man who is loyal to the teachings of the Catholic Church must always be loyal to his country. (Applause.) He will be an honest voter; he will be an honest officer, if he lives up to the teachings of his church. (Applause.)

Now, my friends, I did not suppose I was to address you just now. I have had no consultation with the gentlemen who have done such good work in getting us together, but I venture to say that our mission will be to make Catholics better Christians, and therefore better citizens. (Applause.)

At this point Cardinal Gibbons and Cardinal Taschereau entered the hall, and were escorted to the platform.

The chairman said: Gentlemen, I have the honor of now introducing to you His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec, Cardinal Taschereau (great applause), and I have great pleasure in introducing to you, gentlemen, His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, Cardinal Gibbons, who will address you. (Great applause.)

THE ADDRESS OF CARDINAL GIBBONS.

Gentlemen: In the midst of such an array of eloquence, I am sorry to interrupt the proceedings even for a single moment, but in my own name and in the name of the Catholic clergy and laity o the archdiocese of Baltimore—and I may venture to add also, in the name of the entire community, without regard to faith or creed, I

tender to you all a most cordial welcome to the city of Baltimore. (Applause.)

When the question of holding a congress at this particular time was first broached to me, I did not favor the project, because I feared there would not be sufficient time to dispose of the subjects that would be presented to your consideration. I foresaw that the proceedings of the congress would be dovetailed or sandwiched, so to speak, between the great ceremonial of yesterday and the ceremony of the dedication of the Catholic University of Washington, and when you sandwich a body between two other bodies, it is much the worse for the body that is sandwiched (laughter and applause), for you deprive the individual of his breath, and, above all, you take away from him the power of speech. But I was compelled to yield to the solicitations and representations made to me by some of my honored friends in the western part of this country (laughter), whose opinions I have great respect for, and whom I personally love; and you know that the people of the west are not very easily suppressed. (Laughter.) In fact, I may add, that they are absolutely irrepressible, especially when they are under the leadership of such a great champion of faith and country as the archbishop of St. Paul. (Applause.)

Although the time is short, I hope that this congress will not be held in vain. It will teach us many lessons. It will serve all of us as a school of information and prepare us for holding a more elaborate convention at some future day. (Applause.)

And, gentlemen, it serves another good purpose. It emphasizes and vindicates the important fact that the laity have the right, and have also the duty, of co-operating with the clergy in every good measure affecting the interests of society, of the country, and o the church at large, and for my part I must say that I have had for a long time at heart a desire to see the laity and the clergy come more closely together. (Applause.) I think that in some respects they have been too far and too wide apart, and if the clergy are, as they always will be, the divinely constituted organs for preaching the word of God to the faithful—the organs of faith and morals—then on their part the clergy have very much to learn from the laity, from the wisdom and discretion, from the experience and above all, from the worldly knowledge of the Catholic laity of this country. (Applause.) And it seems to me that there is no country on the face of the earth where the clergy and laity should be more united and should more correspond and co-operate with one another than in the United States. The clergy are supported by the laity, our churches are erected by the laity, our schools are sustained by them, and the salaries of the clergy are handed to them, not on a silver salver of the government, but from the warm hands and hearts of the people themselves. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, I think that on this occasion you will take heart when you see the intelligence and the numbers that are here assembled. In union there is strength, in the physical order, and in the social, and in the moral. A drop of water is powerless by itself, but let those drops of water be multiplied a million-fold and they

become the vast and mighty Mississippi, bearing upon its bosom the treasures of the prairies of the west. A single thread is very weak indeed in itself, but let many threads be joined together and they become a powerful cable, capable of sustaining the strongest vessels, and in like manner, gentlemen, by your corporate union, by your organization, you will become a tower of strength in this country; you will become a great power, a great vital force, and thanks be to God, you will become a power, not unto destruction, but unto edification. (Applause.) You will become a strong power, not, like Samson, to pull down the walls of our political constitution, but to sustain, and to uphold, and to build them up. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, once more I bid you a most hearty welcome, and I pray to Almighty God, the source of all light, that your deliberations may be marked by that liberty and independence which characterize free men; that your deliberations may all be marked by the wisdom, and discretion, and political knowledge so characteristic of the Catholic community in the United States, and above all, that your discussions may be marked by that wisdom, that charity, that forbearance toward one another, which becomes members of the church of Jesus Christ and children of the same God and brothers of the great legislator, Jesus Christ, the great social leader of mankind, and children of the same church, and brothers of the same family, "having one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all." (Applause.)

Mr. Kernan then concluded his remarks, which were interrupted by the arrival of His Eminence, in these words:

CONCLUSION OF MR. KERNAN'S SPEECH.

His Eminence need have said no word apologizing for interrupting our proceedings; we are delighted to be interrupted by his wisdom and zeal, and his care for us all on all occasions. (Applause.)

My friends, I was saying to you that this association, as I understand its general purpose, was for the purpose of mutual counsel, by mutual action, to make us laymen better Catholics, and therefore better patriots and greater lovers of our country. And why should not we Catholics love the political institutions of these United States? There is no country in the world, Catholic or Protestant, where our church is as free from persecution and as free from harsh treatment as in these United States. (Applause.) Thank God; our spiritual father, the Pope, requires no concordat with the government of the United States to enable him to appoint bishops and cardinals. That he has to do in Catholic countries too often. They seek to use the church as a slave of the government, and hence they interfere with the appointment of bishops and with others matters touching the spiritual authority of the Pope. But thank God, in America he appoints his bishops without any leave from the government, and the government desires to offer no interference. (Applause.)

We will be faithful to these institutions where every man has the right and is respected for fearlessly on all proper occasions avowing what he believes to be his duty to his God by practising that religion which he thinks is the correct one, and which he thinks he ought to practise.

We desire to aid in building up a body of manly, courageous, patriotic Catholic laymen who will always try to be in charitable relations with those who differ from them in religion, and will always be faithful to their own, and always faithful to this government which gives them and their children the great God-given right of worshipping God freely and fearlessly according to the dictates of their own conscience. I do not desire to coerce any person of a different creed to worship God as I think is right. I desire to encourage him to examine for himself, and I respect him when he has so examined, for teaching his children and worshipping God according to what he believes is right himself, and not according to what I believe is right. I ask to-day the same right and privilege for ourselves. But, my friends, the hour for adjournment has come; I will not detain you longer. I am delighted to be here with you, and I trust we shall so act that all of the people in these United States will say, "These men mean to be true Christians, and they will be better patriots for it." (Applause.)

MR. ONAHAN—I am desired by the chariman of the local committee of arrangements to make two brief announcements; one is that a lunch has been prepared for the members of the congress, and is ready in the adjoining hall. The second announcement is that the citizens of Baltimore on Thursday, which is indicated as Baltimore Day, will entertain the delegates to this congress by excursions to the various Catholic institutions of the city, and other points of interest, the details of which will be found in the newspapers. Since time is of the utmost importance with this congress, I suggest, and I do not doubt it will meet with the concurrence of the congress at once, in the interest of the economy of time, that the temporary organization of the congress be made the permanent organization, and that the rules to govern the deliberations of this congress for the temporary organization be made the rules of the permanent organization. (Applause.)

The question was put and the motion was carried unanimously.

A recess of twenty minutes was then taken for lunch, while the chairman was forming the committees.

At the expiration of the recess the chairman called the congress to order, and presented the names of the gentlemen to compose the committee on resolutions as follows: Morgan J. O'Brien, New York; William Walsh, Maryland; John B. Colahan, Pennsylvania; William L. Kelly, Minnesota; Henry F. Brownson, Michigan; T. J. Semmes, Louisiana; C. A. Mair, Illinois; John C. Donnelly,

Michigan; Bartholomew E. Linehan, Iowa; Charles F. McKenna, Pennsylvania; M. W. O'Brien, Michigan.

The chair then presented the names of the committee to wait upon the president of the United States. The committee was as follows: Jos. J. O'Donoghue, John Byrne, New York; Richard Storrs Willis, Michigan; H. J. Spaunhorst, Missouri; John D. Keiley, New York; Dr. John Guerin, Illinois; Francis Kernan, New York; B. T. Du Val, Arkansas; Daniel A. Rudd, Ohio; Anthony Kelley, Minnesota; Alexander Porter Morse, District of Columbia; M. Glennon, Virginia; Jas. David Coleman, Louisiana; Daniel Troy, Alabama.

MR. ONAHAN—I move that the chairman of this convention be the chariman of the committee to wait upon the president of the United States. (Applause.) I take leave to put the motion.

The motion was put and it was adopted unanimously.

The next business taken up was the reading of papers.

CATHOLIC CONGRESSES.

FIRST REGULAR PAPER, BY JOHN GILMARY SHEA, LL.D., OF NEW YORK.

Mr. President and Fellow Members of the First American Catholic Congress: For the first time in the history of our republic representative lay Catholics meet together in a general body in the old Catholic metropolis of the country, endeared to us all by the religious associations of a hundred years. Of many races and lands, we come hither bound in the unity of faith from the broad prairie and cultivated field, from counting house, office, and study, from the pursuit of art and science, from the chair of professor and editor, from the workshop and mill, from the mines where men wrest from nature's storehouse the material for national progress. Diverse in origin, in occupation, in political ideas, as Catholics there is no division line to sever us; the church is one and unites us in her unity, as our national life is gradually blending us all into one vast Catholic body of the English tongue.

A Catholic congress, a meeting of Catholic gentlemen representing the laity of the church in all parts of the United States, assembling to consider the interests of our people, as citizens of our beloved country, and also as members of the great brotherhood of the church spread throughout the world, is something that has been often desired, often projected, but only now for the first time carried out.

There were times when great Catholic interests were managed in every country by kings and courts, who often assumed a position of hostility to the Holy See, which the faithful deplored. Now the voice of the people controls, or is supposed to control, the government through representative bodies. Unfortunately, these bodies seldom represent the religious element in any state, and even in countries

once deeply Catholic they have fallen into the hands of men, who, while professing the greatest respect for liberty and for the inalienable rights of man, lose no opportunity to curtail and annihilate, so far as they can, the rights of Catholic citizens in the domain of religion.

This has rendered it necessary for Catholics, as such, to meet in congresses, in order to look after Catholic interests, give expression to their sense of wrong, to make a profession of their faith and of their adherence to the See of Peter, to show that they are not, as their enemies suppose, mere blind tools to be led like sheep by their clergy and to be trampled on with impunity by their opponents. Catholics can thus make it evident to the world that, honoring in the highest degree the supreme pontificate, the priesthood, and the episcopate placed over them by divine institution in the church of God, ready to support them in their labors for the good of souls, acting in perfect harmony with them as parts of one spiritual body, the laity are none the less alive to their civil and political rights, and determined to maintain them, are ready to take part in all movements for progress in literature, art, science—in all that tends to increase human happiness within the lawful bounds of religion and morality.

The holding of such congresses in Europe, especially in Germany and Belgium, has been attended with the most beneficial results in banishing apathy, rousing a healthy Catholic public spirit, and leading to a more perfect organization of the faithful to secure their rights, prevent oppression and injustice, and carry out good works needed by the time and place.

As Americans we can claim that the idea and the very name of congress originated with us. The Continental Congress stands out in the annals of history; at first a mere body of delegates met to present humble petitions, to expose their wrongs and ask redress; it became by the force of circumstances a government, raising armies, holding at bay the greatest kingdom in Europe, winning recognition from foreign nations, and molding thirteen isolated colonies into a firm and solid republic that for a century has excited the wonder of the world.

The Catholic congresses held in Europe had their general and their local characteristics. In Germany Catholics found themselves suddenly exposed to a bitter and terrible persecution from the new empire. They had done nothing to provoke the persecution; the Catholic princes and states, the Catholics in Protestant realms had borne their share in the war, priests had exposed their lives as chaplains on every battle field, sisters had nursed the sick and wounded. The decrees of the Vatican Council were made the pretext, and the religious orders were banished, then secular priests were torn from their parishes, and bishops from their sees, till the faithful in almost countless churches were left without priest or sacrifice. The Catholic body already providentially organized made a noble struggle to force the repeal of these Draconian laws. Citizens, deprived of their rights, they sent to the legislative hall men to demand redress. Apathy disappeared; the people were aroused; all felt that unless they contended manfully for their rights, all was lost. Catholic

Germany came forth with a unanimity, courage, and ability, that astonished the men who wished to substitute blood and iron for conscience, and who expected to find a community deprived of its spiritual guides — a timid, crouching, disorganized body. The result was due mainly to the influence exerted throughout Germany by a series of Catholic congresses, the first of which was held at Mayence in 1848, when a constitution was adopted that received the approval of the German episcopate and of the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IX. The congress that met in October, 1848, in the old electoral palace, was not exclusively, nor even predominantly, a lay body, but the committees were composed of laymen, and few of the orators came from the ranks of the clergy. Chevalier Francis Joseph von Buss, of Freiburg, founder of the Catholic associations in Germany, presided in the congress of delegates from those bodies. The Bayard of the church in Germany, he electrified every assemblage he addressed by his learning, his deep and earnest devotion to his church and his country. Catholic education, Catholic art, Catholic music, Catholic architecture and vestments, science and the press, were subjects treated and discussed in the earlier congresses of these associations. The claims of Catholic charity were constantly brought before the congresses, and plans suggested for supplying the void caused throughout Europe by the suppression and spoliation of the religious orders which began with Portugal's attack on the Jesuits in 1759, and has been continued in country after country to our day.

The later congresses in Germany had serious questions before them, as we have seen, when the very existence of the Church was threatened. This year the Catholic congress at Bochum spoke manfully on the Roman question: "We claim the complete independence of the Holy See, and we shall not cease to demand it. We reserve always, as a thing apart, the rights of the Pope. We shall aid the Holy Father by our prayers, our means, and our political action, and we have every trust in the triumph of the church, knowing that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her."

The Catholic congress at Munich, the spontaneous manifestation of the whole kingdom, renews in the most decisive terms the condemnation of Italian hostility to the church and the sovereign pontiff. Presided over by Dr. Joerg, it declared: "The Catholics of Bavaria share the sorrow and indignation of all sons of the Catholic Church at the unmeasured insults inflicted upon the Holy Father, and are convinced that a situation worthy of the Pope, or the exercise of the supreme pastoral office, is not to be secured except by the restoration of his temporal power."

We can re-echo the words of Bochum and Munich.

The first Catholic congress in Belgium was held in Mechlin in 1863, Ducpetiaux being the organizer and soul of the assembly. Every part of Belgium was represented by large numbers of delegates, and eminent Catholics from other countries responded to the invitation to attend and address the congress. The voice of Cardinal Wiseman, and the voice of Bishop Dupanloup were heard in the Petit Seminaire of Mechlin.

The fruit of these congresses was soon seen in new educational

efforts, in the multiplication of Catholic journals, in articles and books discussing the themes treated of in these assemblies. The power of association became more generally acknowledged, indifferent and timid Catholics were roused to earnestness, courage, and action.

Germany held an annual congress, sometimes in one city, sometimes in another. Then Switzerland followed the example of Germany and Belgium; and this year Spain and Bavaria join the general movement, as we now do.

How Catholic Germany, led by men formed in these congresses, has by peaceful but earnest agitation secured an almost complete repeal of oppressive laws is well known.

Spain has been for half a century rent by an ever recurring civil war; but Catholics divided politically would not harmonize, and, as often happens, a faction hostile to religion contrived to control the government, and but too frequently use its power against the church and the Catholic masses. The congress of 1889, due mainly to the bishop of Madrid, was planned with great caution to avoid all the old jealousies and bring Spaniards of all types together purely as Catholics. The congress was conducted in the most harmonious manner, and the results promise to be of great and lasting service to the church.

In the United States a Catholic congress has long been desired. More than twenty years ago the *Catholic World* took the subject up and showed alike the beneficial result of such assemblages in Europe, and the immense work which might be accomplished by them in this country. Though the matter has been mooted from time to time, nothing was done, and Catholic interests have been left to individual, isolated action, or the partial action of a few societies. The meeting of sympathy with Pius IX in 1867 was not even wholly Catholic; and the first meeting to denounce the spoiliation of the propaganda by the Italian government was called by a single society, the Xavier Union. We have not now, and had not at those dates, any organization representing the Catholics of the whole country, and alive, through its committees, to all Catholic interests. Yet all will admit that the formation of such a body is as feasible as it is necessary.

Though Catholics belong to all political parties, this constitutes no impediment to harmonious action. A greater difficulty lies in the fact that a large number of Catholics are by birth German, Irish, Canadian, Polish, Portuguese, Flemish, and many descendants of immigrants of those nations remain attached to the language and ideas of their parents, while others are absorbed in the English-speaking body descended from those who settled in Maryland and elsewhere from 1634 to a period two centuries later. Besides these we have Catholics of French and Spanish race, and still of French or Spanish speech in parts acquired by treaty, who remain in a manner isolated. We have, too, our colored and Indian Catholics.

While the Catholics of other countries are generally homogeneous, with the same language, customs, and traditions, we have here in the United States men of all races and languages, like the

multitude who gathered around the apostles on the wonderful day of Pentecost; but by drawing close the bonds of brotherhood the voice of the church, uttered in the name of Peter, will come to each and all, as the tongue in which they were born.

Unfortunately, considerations of language and race have done much to isolate us from each other and to prevent harmonious and united co-operation while they weakened our force in creating a healthy public opinion in the country, so far as the church and her interests are concerned. United in the same faith, emulating each other in love and devotion to the Holy See, in personal sympathy with the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Leo XIII, amid his trials and afflictions, his imprisonment, and the outrages heaped upon him by the shameless usurpers of the Eternal City, governed by the same bishops, fortified from the cradle to the grave by the same sacraments, we certainly should not let the sin of Babel divide heart from heart when the miracle of Pentecost should give us grace to be of one heart and one mind.

We have Catholic societies and organizations, but they are generally identified with race; few are simply Catholic. Hence these bodies, even when they meet in conventions and show the most laudable activity and zeal, do not represent the laity of the whole church in the republic, but only particular phases of it.

The German Catholics of the United States, trained in their own land to appreciate the value of association, have carried out the idea more thoroughly here, and the conventions of their societies, like that held this year at Cleveland, produce great and important results by the number, unanimity, zeal, and activity of the 439 societies, which claim a membership of 600,000. The Young Men's Catholic Union embraces an array of eighty-five societies, and is the most influential after the German Verein. The Irish Catholic Benevolent Union draws together the beneficial societies formed among those of Irish origin; the Total Abstinence societies co-operate together, and the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, wide-spread and efficient, does its work unobtrusively, rarely by general conventions making known its labors or exciting attention. An attempt was made to form Catholic unions throughout the country, and by a central organization constitute a national body; but the plan did not fulfill its earlier promise, and the unions are virtually extinct.

Thus, though conventions of Catholic societies are held, there has been no congress or body representing the whole Catholic community without distinction of nationality, and seeking to attain unanimous action in all that concerns us as a body, in relation to the Holy See, to our own federal and state governments, the special works of charity or Christian zeal, and the general questions of education, science, art, architecture, music, literature, the diffusion of truth, and the counteracting of errors.

The present congress is spontaneous and tentative. It is an attempt to bring about a necessary and long-desired organization.

The general interests affecting all American Catholics are mainly

our relation to the Holy See and to the government of the United States.

We can, in the name of our fellow-citizens, make a full and distinct profession of faith in all that the church teaches, and our loyalty to its government by the Sovereign Pontiff. Churches in other lands may boast of having been founded by some one of the apostles. In this country we owe all directly to the Popes. Offshoots of the hierarchies of England, France and Spain were planted, and the work of the church was carried on under the direction of the Supreme Pontiffs, till the happy day, a century ago, when the great Pope Pius VI, blending all the Catholics of the United States, of all races and origins, into one organization, erected the see of Baltimore directly dependent on the chair of Peter, with a diocese commensurate with the limits of the republic, and placed at its head in Baltimore the Rt. Rev. John Carroll. Men of English, French, and Spanish origin, with Catholics from Germany and Ireland, Indians and negroes, thus from the first constituted the faithful of the diocese of Baltimore, the Catholics of the United States. Heirs of their faith in the one church of all lands and times, we here profess our deep and loyal reverence for the See of Peter, our firm and devoted adherence to the reigning Pontiff, Pope Leo XIII, and our demand that he be delivered from his state of subjection, and restored to that political independence necessary to the proper government of the church. Rome, the capital of the Catholic world, must cease to be a spot where the Catholic religion and its venerable head are daily oppressed and outraged; where Christianity is derided, public honor paid to a profligate atheist, and hymns openly sung to Satan, with the tacit sanction or direct act of the usurping government.

The congress can express its appreciation of the services rendered to religion by the Catholic congresses of Germany, Bavaria, Belgium, Spain, and Switzerland, and its deep sense of the great benefits which have resulted from Catholic associations in the United States, and the hope that by united and harmonious action they will soon aid in making the Catholic congresses of the United States potent for good.

The government of the United States is by the amended constitution precluded from making an established church, yet while not directly doing this, the federal government has constantly invaded the rights of Catholics secured by the constitution or by treaty. Property belonging to the church has in more than one instance been seized, the religious rights of Catholics in the military and naval forces of the United States are often, indeed almost invariably, disregarded.

The Indian department calls for prompt and energetic action. It has for years been managed in a way to thwart the labors of Catholic missionaries among the native tribes, break up their establishments as soon as they show signs of prosperity, and place Catholic Indians and their schools under non-Catholic control.

In the several states questions arise from time to time relating to education, the power of Catholics to dispose of their property by will, the rights of Catholics to freedom of worship in penal and elee-

mosynary institutions, rights of Catholics to their property in churches and institutions. In these the congress can only co-operate with local advocates of the right; but there seems to be a necessity for the creation of a Catholic legal board for the whole country, composed of able lawyers, to whom all important law cases can be confided, and whose legal experience and special studies will insure in the first instance a clear and sound decision, obviating long and tedious appeals.

The voice of the Sovereign Pontiff proclaims: "We must make education more Catholic." This is all the more necessary, as the tendency in the country is to exclude all religion and the very name of God from the schools. This renders the maintenance and extension of religious schools a matter of paramount necessity.

In counteracting error and spreading among our own people and unbiased inquirers, truth in regard to our doctrines, worship, and history, much is yet to be done. English-speaking Catholics number now about 20,000,000, about one-half in America. Yet the diffusion of Catholic books, periodicals, and papers is altogether too limited. Co-operation between Great Britain and Ireland and this country, properly organized, might do much to multiply and spread healthy Catholic reading. The Catholic press will be treated specially, and requires no comment here.

Associations for the diffusion of Catholic books have been attempted, but though the results were not encouraging, we ought by proper organization to do what other religious bodies accomplish in this respect.

Catholic historical societies are doing good work to rectify omissions, suppressions, and falsifications of current books, used even in schools, and need generous encouragement.

The papers that will be read before the congress treat of the great questions affecting us all as Catholic citizens of a free country: Education, literature, charitable organizations, the care of the afflicted, the diffusion of truth, and the defense of our rights. But there is one thought to nerve us all. After two centuries of struggle we have had our church organized for a hundred years. It has grown and stands to-day an object of admiration. The Catholic Church in the United States is to-day the only body that speaks with no uncertain voice on questions of faith. Her creed, her worship, her judgment on questions is known, fixed, invariable. Others may hesitate, may change, may alter. People begin to look to the church with respect. Other denominations begin to return to its tenets, to its externals; the cross, the altar, vestments, lights, once objects of scorn, are now approved and accepted. We of the laity touch every day intelligent inquirers; it is our duty to know our faith and to explain it. It is our duty to edify by our lives, and edify means to build the church.

There are thus many and vital questions for the consideration of the lay congress, and which can be discussed with advantage. The Catholic laity of the country, aroused by the reports of the members, can thus prepare to devise and plan concurrent action so as to give strength to the whole body. Keep alive attachment to

the church, and secure from the designs of latent or overt proselytism the rising generations, that the faith may be handed down intact from sire to son. (Applause.)

LAY ACTION IN THE CHURCH.

SECOND REGULAR PAPER, BY HENRY F. BROWNSON, LL. D., OF DETROIT, MICH.

THIS ASSEMBLY of the Catholics of the United States in their first congress is a scene of unusual interest, and promises results of the greatest importance.

We have seen similar gatherings, in other lands, of venerable ecclesiastics and learned laymen, for the purpose of discussing the questions now agitating society in every country.

There have been congresses in this country of special classes and interests; but a congress composed of laymen of every class, section, and nationality, meeting to consider the general interests of the whole Catholic population of the Union, is now held for the first time.

We pretend not to be superior to others in wisdom or prudence, or better able to apply Catholic principles to social questions. But living, as we do, in the only land on earth where the state declares itself incompetent in spirituals, and leaves to every individual complete religious, as well as civil, freedom, we have not to inquire, as in other countries, what the government will permit us to do, or what will be the effect of our action on our political or civil standing — complex questions, indeed, and leading to divergency of opinion and weakness of action — but have simply to understand the questions, and the principles which should govern their solution, and to make the necessary application. We have only to ask, What is right? What is best? This greater freedom which we enjoy will naturally lead to bolder and more straight-forward discussion, and to more vigorous action.

Congresses of this character have not been convoked in the past ages of the church, for the simple reason that there was no work that required their assembling. They are necessary now, in consequence of the introduction of popular government, that they may give a correct tone to public opinion; they are necessary because individuals now count for little, except as the units constituting corporations, associations, trusts, and syndicates; they are necessary because the enemies of Christianity are banded together in a league against us, and can be resisted only by united action; they are, in fine, necessary here and now because the Catholic body in the United States is made up of various nationalities, with a diversity of customs, traditions, and interests, which tend to separate them one from another, and it is consequently necessary to draw closer the bonds which unite us all as members of the one body of Christ, children of the same mother church, and heirs of the same eternal home in heaven.

We do not meet to discuss questions of faith, or principles of morals, or to reform the discipline of the church. We leave all that

to the pastors commissioned to teach and to govern. But we are assembled to express our Catholic loyalty, and our sympathy with our persecuted head, to protect our rights, to throw such light as we can on social problems; and to do all that lies in our power to instruct and aid those less fortunate than ourselves.

The laity are bound by the precepts of charity as well as are the clergy, and have in all ages endeavored to coöperate with the clergy in the work of saving souls, and alleviating human misery.

In the first ages of Christianity the part taken by the laity in the action of the church was so much more prominent than in later times, that many have maintained that the distinction of clergy and laity was unknown in the apostolic age. Such is not the fact. But it is nevertheless true, that after the conquest of Rome by the barbarians, a change in this respect was induced by the altered conditions of society. The laity sat in the first general synod, presided over by St. Peter, though, doubtless, they left the judgment to the apostles and ancients. Later the emperors sat in their place.

The laity elected the first deacons, and they participated in the choice of a successor to Judas Iscariot. They had a voice in the election of popes and bishops as late as the latter half of the eleventh century, after which time the cathedral chapters elected bishops; though there are instances in the twelfth century of such election by people and clergy.

Laymen preached and expounded sacred Scripture in church, from the earliest period. When Origen, at the request of the bishops of Palestine, began to preach at Cæsarea, the metropolitan of Alexandria, Demetrius, desired his return to Egypt, and expressed astonishment at his preaching in church and before bishops. St. Alexander, metropolitan of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, bishop of Cæsarea, replied that they could not see how Demetrius could say it was an unheard-of thing for laymen to preach in church in the presence of bishops; for it was customary for bishops to request such laymen as had the ability, to explain the Scriptures in their churches. They cite three other instances within their own knowledge, and cannot tell how many other such instances there might be. The objection of Demetrius merely proves that the custom was falling into disuse in the third century, and was no longer as general as it had been in the second century or in the apostolic age.

The laity aided greatly in the conversion of the Roman empire and the overthrow of paganism. By their apologies, their discourses in the senate, their social, political, and religious influence generally, they had given such a tone of Christianity to the empire that, whether Constantine was sincere or not in throwing his influence on the side of Christianity, he would have been wanting in statesmanship if he had continued to uphold the failing cause.

From Hermas, whose "Shepherd" was read in church as inspired Scripture, there was a succession of great laymen, whose writings in defense of the church against Jews, gentiles, and heretics contributed to the triumph of Christianity in the fourth century. The author of the epistle to Diognetes, St. Aristides, St. Agrippa, Castor, St. Aristo of Pella, St. Hegesippus, St. Athenagoras,

Apollonius, Hermias, Miltiades, Candidus, Apion, Rhodon, Ammonius, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, and Arnobius illustrated the early ages of Christianity by their writings, whilst Roman senators like St. Apollonius, in the reign of Commodus, boldly spoke in its defense in the senate of Rome.

In the first ages, the Catholic laity, mingling with those outside of the church, were, in a sense, missionaries. Their influence was felt in every class and occupation of society, in which they gathered catechumens for the bishops.

After the conversion of the barbarians, the action of the laity was in many respects different from what it had been under the empire. The whole population having become Catholic, their action was now directed within the church, except so far as they were engaged in military movements against the infidels for the defense of the country or to recover the lost portions.

During these centuries they rivalled the popes and bishops and lower order of the clergy in their labors for the establishment of religious, eleemosynary, and educational institutions.

As the middle ages passed away, absolutism, which had triumphed in the lower empire, and caused the Greek schism, acquired supremacy in Europe. Its main defenders in former ages, the French and German tyrants, had been opposed and excommunicated by the popes. A more powerful enemy to religion than even heresy, it strengthened Protestantism, and was strengthened by it in turn. Catholic nations were the last to accept it; and in their conservative spirit, are the last to abandon it. Deposed from the thrones, it still lingers in the habits of thought and modes of action of those who reject indiscriminately everything that savors of modern civilization. But, as the church accepted the Roman and the mediæval civilizations, encouraging what was good in them, and endeavoring to eliminate the evil, so now our Holy Father, in his allocutions and encyclicals, has distinctly pointed out the different elements of our present civilization. If we would weigh well his words, we should see that it is our duty to accept all that is good in this civilization, instead of vainly attempting to resist the march of events, and to bring back again the dead past.

WhenCatholicity had become a part of the municipal law it was the policy of both church and state to cut off all communication between Catholics and heretics, and for fear of heretical utterances on the part of the laity to repress all expression on their part in connection with religion. Imprimaturs were introduced and ecclesiastical revision before publication when books began to be multiplied by new invention. It was hoped that the faith could be preserved by the suppression of unsound doctrine.

The conditions of things are now changed. Nowhere are the people all Catholics, and even in the few countries where they are nearly so, it is impossible to prevent them from hearing false doctrines. To pretend to keep them from error by the restriction of free speech in these days is as idle as to blow against the wind. Those within the church who are likely to say anything to the injury of religion can no more be repressed by ecclesiastical supervision

than those without. The only men whose utterances can thus be checked are the loyal and obedient sons of the church, from whom there is no danger to be apprehended.

The canons of the church would seem to be strict enough in this regard. They subject the writer to ecclesiastical censure for whatever errors he may fall into; but I think there is no canon, not fallen into desuetude, if it ever existed, that prohibits him from speaking on matters connected with religion without the license of ecclesiastical authority first obtained. If he speaks or writes without previous supervision, he merely does so at his risk, and must submit to the penalty if he goes astray.

Almighty God has, in his infinite wisdom, allowed man the liberty of thought and of speech, foreseeing, as he did, how extensively that liberty would be abused. Undoubtedly, he has forbidden such abuse, and all wilful error of thought or word is sinful. But his glory demanded the service of free minds and tongues; and the devout utterances of mankind in all ages have glorified their Maker with a glory that all the heresies and blasphemies from the beginning have failed to diminish — nay, have only made the brighter.

It is better that men should sometimes fall into involuntary error than that they should stagnate in silence and imbecility. If we were to burn all the books of writers who have made mistakes in matters of faith and morals, how many fathers and doctors of the church would escape?

In spite of our regrets, the mediæval epoch has passed, and we no longer live in a nominally Catholic society. We are surrounded by heretical and pagan influences. We are very nearly back where the world was 1,900 years ago, and all the nations need to be reconverted and society regenerated. Whilst we devote our resources to keeping those we already have, our losses are enormous. We shall go on losing still more unless we extend our efforts to the world around us. Not to advance is to recede. If we do nothing to convert those amongst whom we live, they will succeed in leading away large numbers from us.

For this it is necessary that we bring our intellectual life into harmony with our religious. If religion was deeply rooted in the intellect and the will — man's rational nature, and that which distinguishes him from other animals — free and intelligent men would be able to act and to speak, when occasion is presented, in accordance with the principles they have learned and assimilated to their life. A child, a slave, or a barbarian may need to be commanded or instructed at every step; but not those who have attained to maturity, freedom, and civilization. With the great mass, religion is less a matter of the rational than of the sentimental nature. Because faith is feeble, the sentiments and affections have to be captivated by every variety of devotion, and the sentimental spirit of the age threatens to pervade every mind. In its truest expression, in popular literature, this spirit has degraded the holy affection of conjugal love to a sentiment common to men and beasts; and it would make piety a thing of sensibility, which men will abandon to the tender nurture of "the devout sex." Never was there more devotion and

piety in the church than to-day, and it may be that God has chosen this as the means for the reconversion of the nations. God's ways, indeed, are not man's ways. But it is not for us to fold our arms and trust to prayer alone for the accomplishment of this work. Prayer is good, is necessary; but its effect is to gain divine assistance in our efforts, not to render effort unnecessary. God has, from the beginning, worked through second causes in the supernatural, as in the natural, order. He helps those who help themselves, and requires coöperation on our part. The world has never yet been converted by prayer alone, and it is not likely it ever will be.

The laity have begun everywhere to take an active interest in works directly or indirectly aiding the action of the church. Unfortunately, wherever in the old world they have attempted anything more than the spread of particular devotions, or the establishment of benevolent and educational institutions, they have been embarrassed by the complicated relations of church and state, as well as by love of routine and fear of novelty on the part of many.

The prospect was bright in France when, on the downfall of the House of Orleans, a heroic band of Catholics standing up for religion secured to the church a freedom and prosperity that had not been known in that country since the birth of the French monarchy. But a converted infidel, more cunning in vituperation and sarcasm than wise in understanding the times, gained the confidence of the reactionary party, and by his advocacy of absolutism, so identified Cæsarism with Catholicity in the minds of the French people, that he thwarted all the efforts of the friends of liberty, and left the church a prey to persecution by the enemies of imperialism.

Here, more than in other countries, is there need that the laity should bear their part in church action, and do all that laymen may lawfully do. Our clergy are overworked. They are not numerous enough to supply the wants of those already Catholics, and we ought generously to take as much of their burden as we can upon ourselves. We can do much by our writings, our speeches, and our lives, to disabuse those outside of the church of their prejudices, and to make them understand the true doctrine and practice of the church. All that the church teaches and enjoins is so conformed to right reason, that no man not blinded by prejudice or passion, can refuse his approval, when he clearly knows it. A layman may often get the ear of a non-Catholic that the priest cannot reach, and an intelligent explanation of Catholic doctrine and practice by a layman will, in many cases, carry more weight than that made by the priest, because it is in a language and form of thought better understood and appreciated, and is less likely to be thought insincere.

By exercising their proper influence in politics, Catholics could go far towards purifying them from the corruption which infects them. It is all very well to say that a republican form of government is sustained by the church, and without that support must run into license or misrule; but the church can only exercise her influence through the individual action of her members. If Catholics separate religion from politics, claiming that politics are inde-

pendent of religion, how can the church produce any effect in support of popular government? But if the two or three million Catholic voters in the country were all firmly convinced that the right of suffrage is a trust which they are bound in conscience to exercise in favor of right measures and upright and competent candidates, and were determined to vote honestly, neither buying nor selling their own or another's vote, their influence would do much, if not all that is needed, to bring back our elections to their pristine purity.

If Catholics would unite in the cause of temperance, they could abolish all the drinking-saloons, or bar-rooms in the land, thereby doing away with the main cause of the corruption in politics, the source of more than half of the crimes, and of nearly all the pauperism in the country.

In the great philanthropic and reformatory movements of the day, the Catholic laity might well take part. Instead of holding aloof and decrying such movements as visionary and fanatical, let them join in them, infuse into them the true spirit of charity, and give them a Catholic direction. By assuming their proper share in the management of our hospitals, asylums, prisons, and penitentiaries, they can procure the means of solacing the unfortunate and reforming the erring, and have the right to insist on Catholic inmates being freely ministered to by their own clergy.

I would not underrate the great good now accomplished by our benevolent associations, conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, and other societies of men and women for mutual benefit, or for aiding the poor. I would only multiply them till every Catholic man and woman in the land was enrolled in one or another of them. Everything that will promote the intellectual, moral, or social well-being of the country, is so much gain for religion. For, although the church was not established for the direct purpose of civilizing the nations, she indirectly promotes civilization whilst laboring to fit man for the life hereafter; and the higher the civilization of a people, the more is that people in harmony with Catholicity.

No constitution can be more in harmony with Catholic principles than is the American, and no religion can be in such accord with that constitution as is the Catholic; and while the state is not absorbed in the church, nor the church in the state, but there is external separation, they both derive their life from the same interior principle of Catholic truth, and in their different spheres carry out the same idea.

Our American constitution is the only philosophical, or dialectic, constitution the world has ever known. It has not only eliminated the barbarism of the Græco-Roman civilization, abolished all privileged and slave classes, and extended equal rights to all, but it is founded in a living principle. All life is based on unity in diversity; on extremes, with a medium of reconciliation. Unity without diversity is stagnation or death; diversity without unity is discord. The first results in centralized despotism; the second, in anarchy. Our constitution, by the providential events which gave it both, rather than by human counsel, is not only democratic, but,

by the division of the powers of government between the general and the state governments, each acting in its own sphere, is founded in truth and in reality, has in it the principle of life, and so long as it is preserved in its essential character, cannot die.

The American system is also anti-Protestant, and must either reject Protestantism or be overthrown by it. Based on natural law and justice, our institutions are incompatible with a religion claiming to be revealed, but which fails to harmonize the natural and the supernatural, reason and revelation, calls reason "a stupid ass," and says nature is totally depraved.

The principles of our civilization were taught by the fathers and doctors of the church, her councils and pontiffs, who endeavored in vain to make them prevail under either the Roman or the German order of civilization. What those could not abolish in the Old World, our forefathers left behind, bringing with them all that was worth preserving of European civilization; but not its inequalities or its superstitions. Like the Catholic Church, and like God himself, we are no respecters of persons; but welcome alike all classes, conditions, and colors, so long as they will conduct themselves orderly and decently.

But while the political and civil order of this country is not antagonistic to the church, nor the church hostile to the institutions and patriotism of the nation, it is not pretended that the sentiments or morals of the people are more in accord with Catholicity than in other countries. In public or private virtue, Americans have nothing to boast of over the rest of the world. whatever may have been the fact in this respect a hundred, or even fifty, years ago, and we do not ask our citizens of foreign birth to adopt our morals or sentiments, when we speak of their duty to become Americans. What we mean is that they should study the American political and civil order, and labor for the interest of American civilization.

Not only are the sentiments and opinions of the majority of the American people opposed to the church, but many of the habits and usages of portions of the Catholic body are offensive to that majority; and as many Catholics form their opinion of the American civil and political order from the actions and expressions of the American people, non-Catholics are in like manner apt to judge the church by its members. Catholics ought therefore to eliminate from their body such customs as are both offensive to Americans, and disapproved of by the church, study the American system and institutions, and conform to them, and let non-Catholics know the church as she really is, and entire harmony would result in individuals, and the ideal of Christian society be actualized on earth.

Let us mingle more in such works of natural virtue as our non-Catholic fellow-citizens are engaged in, and try to exert a Catholic influence outside of our own body, making ourselves better known, and at the same time that we coöperate in those good works infuse into them something of our holier religion. And as we do this, let us draw closer the bonds that unite us to one another, for union and concord among ourselves will then need strengthening, and will strengthen us in turn.

Individuals count for so little nowadays that to produce any great effect, we must form associations—local associations, and associations for special purposes, but, most of all, one grand organization of the entire Catholic laity of the United States, with regularly constituted officers and committees, meeting at regular intervals in a Catholic lay congress, for the purpose of manifesting and strengthening their Catholic loyalty and union, defending their rights, and by discussion and instruction helping those who are ignorant or weak. "Religion pure and undefiled with God and the Father is this: To visit the orphans and widows in their trouble and keep one's self unspotted from the world." St. James i: 27.

To enable the laity to work to any advantage in the cause of religion, there must be confidence in them on the part of the clergy, and manliness and freedom on their part. It is necessary that there should be confidence in the intelligence and motives of laymen. If they are only to repeat what is dictated to them, never think for themselves, or dare utter their thoughts, they can have no energy or freedom, and can produce no effect.

The great mass of Catholics adhere to their religion from motives of conscience. Separation from the church is no longer equivalent to outlawry, or privation of fire and water. Every advantage, from a worldly point of view, is now on the other side, and it may well be presumed, until there is proof to the contrary, that such Catholic laymen as devote their time and abilities to the interests of religion, are actuated by love of it. That they will act intelligently is further presumable. They have shown in mechanical, industrial, and commercial enterprises a mental activity that claims admiration, and which would be of inestimable value if applied in the cause of religion and charity. They, as well as the clergy, have been filled with the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands, and made soldiers of Christ's faith, and in their proper sphere, will not lack the guidance of the Divine Spirit.

It is not to be expected that the necessary confidence will be given at once. We must gain it by proving ourselves deserving of it. Let us say what we have to say boldly and distinctly, without circumlocution or insinuation, and when it becomes apparent that there is no guile in us, we shall win the confidence of our pastors, our fellow-Catholics and of the world at large, and our utterances will command attention. (Applause)

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE HOLY SEE.

THIRD REGULAR PAPER, BY CHARLES J. BONAPARTE, OF BALTIMORE, MD.

When Leo III placed on the brow of Charlemagne the diadem of the Cæsars, his act was pregnant with all the problems, solved or yet seeking solution, of later mediæval and modern history; yet of these none was of weightier or more abiding import to mankind than his own relations toward the master he claimed to give the Christian world. He and men about him may not have

feared lest the heir of Peter should sink into a spiritual exarch for the heir of Augustus, a patriarch of the old Rome as subservient to her temporal ruler as the patriarch of the new Rome ever was to him who bore sway on the Bosphorus, or as the patriarch of Moscow should once be to the autocrat of the Kremlin; but humanly speaking, this was more than possible. Disguised by mutual reverence and unbroken concord under the great Charles; postponed by the weakness of his earlier successors, and the anarchy of ensuing ages, the momentous question whether the Roman pontiff was the Roman emperor's first servant or his elder colleague, as supreme in his own province of government as the Cæsar in his, became daily more and more urgent when the great Saxon and Franconian emperors had converted into a practical dominion over central Europe the shadowy tradition of Charlemagne's wider realm. The answer was sought amid conflicting claims and inconsistent precedents, until given by the issue of a gigantic struggle, which for two centuries distracted Latin Christendom. One hundred and eighty years of strife from the Hildebrandine reforms to the death of Frederick the Second assured the liberty of the Holy See by the destruction, in all but form, of its most splendid creation. The Holy Roman Empire entered on its contest with the power that gave it birth at the zenith of its dignity and strength; that contest left it hardly more than a spectre; *magni nominis umbra*. It existed long afterwards, and from time to time men dreamed that it might be recalled to true life, but with the fall of the Hohenstaufen it received its death wound; through all its long decline of five hundred and fifty years down to its inglorious end it was never again, unless by an abuse of language, either holy, or Roman, or an empire. Europe gave up what was perhaps the most gorgeous and seductive phantasy of the Middle Ages, the vision of a universal Christian monarchy, because its realization was found practically inconsistent with freedom for the earthly head of the Christian Church. Nor, to my mind, was this loss too high a price to pay for the lesson, that, although it matters little if the Pope be an exile or a captive, a subject he cannot be; where he is at home, there of right he must be master.

Thus Catholic Christians have thought for six centuries; is there any reason why they should think otherwise now? Before replying let us for a moment consider what was gained to the church and to the world by the liberty bought with so great a price.

Its most obvious consequence was to save Europe from a universal dominion. The Emperor Henry III was the undoubted sovereign of all Germany, northern and central Italy, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and those other lands which made up the earlier Lotharingia and later Burgundy; he was acknowledged as over-lord by Denmark, Hungary, and Poland; and could advance plausible, though disputed, pretensions to the suzerainty of France, Spain, and even England. Had this vast overshadowing power subjugated to itself the whole ecclesiastical order in the person of its chief; had submissive popes wielded the weapons under which the empire crumbled to further the claims it had inherited from Charlemagne, and to which feudalism had given wider scope and a shape more imme-

diately formidable; had the crusades found in the emperors their natural leaders, and the two great orders of military priesthood which sprang from them become, as these so well might have become, the militia of the advocate of the Universal Church; had the general strengthening of royal authority, which came with the revived study of the civil law, inured to the benefit of a single supreme ruler instead of many national princes, the history of western Europe might well have foreshadowed the centralization and absolutism of Russia. And all these things might have happened, nay, it is overwhelmingly probable that all of them would have happened, but for the vindicated freedom of the Holy See.

This, however, is but little compared with other results, which are not less certainly its fruit. Amid all the bloodshed, lawlessness and disorder of mediæval Europe, an influence was working, destined to regenerate the world. In the weary ages while a man's dwelling was a fortress, to be held by the strong hand against well nigh every other man, that dwelling was growing to be something to him which classical antiquity had never known. Chronic anarchy had almost blotted from his mind the conceptions of patriotism and civic duty, but if it robbed him of a country, it gave him a home. Living constantly with his wife and children and immediate dependents, seldom meeting other men except as enemies, always finding at his own hearth the center of his thoughts and affections, the domestic virtues, the sentiments which dignify and sweeten family life gained in him a strength which was new to the world. And on this basis was gradually built up a revived patriotism. He who had learned to think with a kind of reverence of his mother, his wife, his children, was slowly but surely taught to respect other women and children and to prize the welfare of all those too weak to defend themselves; then to feel strongly his own duty to afford them protection from wrong; then to see clearly that such protection could be adequately provided only by an orderly government; finally to recognize the value of this government, and to love and serve it for the great good it wrought. Feudalism itself gave to Europe the agency which converted feudalism into lawful society, but feudalism alone could not have given it. Closely analogous conditions have existed and now exist in many Mahometan countries. Their outcome has never been the same; no social regeneration has ever sprung from a harem, and that the unbridled license and universal violence of mediæval times created homes, was due, not to feudalism simply, but to feudalism tempered and inspired by the Christian church. Yet between the church and feudal ideas there was for many generations a life-and-death struggle, of all the more doubtful issue because to men of those days its significance was veiled. The church in the end transformed and thus overthrew feudalism, but feudalism tried hard to transform and thus stifle the church. The question as to investitures, which at last brought Gregory VII and Henry IV into open collision, was a phase in the scheme of reform by which that great pontiff strove to enforce celibacy and eradicate simony among the secular clergy. Whatever may have been the emperor's immediate motive, in resisting this he was defending, more or less con-

sciously, the vital principle of feudal society. Every civil or military ruler then purchased his authority of a superior and transmitted it at the same fixed price to his son; it was in the logic of events that this system must either be extended to archbishops and bishops or abandoned for judges and generals. The subjugation of the papacy meant the inevitable, if not immediate, feudalization of the clergy, and this would have as inevitably converted them into a caste of sacerdotal nobility, practically indistinguishable in manners and morals from the barons and knights about them. A church thus maimed and fettered would have been alike helpless and unworthy as the champion of Christian morality, and the renaissance, if it came, would have softened only to further and more foully corrupt. The moral health, no less than the national life and political liberties of all the peoples of western Europe, hinged on the independence of the Holy See.

If, then, this independence has cost so much and done so much more, he who questions its present and permanent value is bound to show clearly that we can spare what our fathers prized so highly and justly, and this no one has, to my knowledge, even attempted to do. The church extends to-day through lands unknown to the great Hildebrand; encounters enemies, obstacles, dangers, of which he never thought; employs agencies which to him might have savored of miracle or magic; but, after all, she is still the same church and she lives in the same world; she preaches the same Gospel, she deals with the same human nature, and she needs now, as she needed then, a chief ruler who for what he does or leaves undone shall answer at no human judgment seat.

Nineteen years ago the Italian government forcibly deprived Pius IX of all temporal authority. In doing this it professed a scrupulous regard for his independence as head of the Catholic Church, and, by the famous statute of May 13, 1871, entitled, "Law Regarding the Prerogatives of the Sovereign Pontiff and the Relations of the Church and State," but generally known as the "Law of Guarantees," it claimed and still claims to have assured this independence. The *odium theologicum* is so insidious a bias, it is so hard where this may enter to represent fairly your adversary's contention, that I prefer to set forth the purport of this statute in the language of one who aided in its enactment and wrote to persuade his readers that the Holy See had no reasonable ground for complaint respecting it.

"The person of the Pope," he says, "is declared as sacred and inviolable as that of the king; to assault, incite to assault, insult, or use contumelious language regarding him, whether the offence consist in act, word, or any form of publication, are crimes to be punished precisely as if they affected the king. Sovereign honors are to be everywhere rendered to the pontiff, his palaces and person are to be guarded by his own guards. The apostolic palaces of the Vatican and Lateran and Villa of Castel Gandolfo are exempted from taxation and cannot be taken under the right of eminent domain. During a vacancy in the Holy See the personal liberty of the cardinals shall be absolute, and the government warrants the security and freedom of conclaves and ecumenical councils, and neither the places where these are

held nor any building containing the Pope, whether his stay be permanent or transient, can be entered by the police or other public force, unless at the request of the Pope, council, or conclave. The archives of the pontifical congregations or ministries are exempted from inspection, perquisition, or sequestration. The sovereign pontiff may attach ordinances to the doors of basilicas and other churches, and neither the police nor any one else can remove these. Those ecclesiastics who are employed by him in his spiritual administration cannot be called to account for anything they may do or say in that capacity, whether they are Italian subjects or foreigners. Foreign ministers accredited to the Holy Father and his agents accredited to foreign governments are to be accorded the full diplomatic privileges. The Pope has a special postal and telegraphic service; he pays nothing for telegrams which he sends or receives, and minute precautions are taken to assure the secrecy of his correspondence. Seminaries, academies, colleges, and other Catholic institutions intended for the education of ecclesiastics in the city of Rome and the six suffragan dioceses continue under the exclusive control of the Holy See, without any interference from the minister of public instruction. Finally a perpetual and inalienable endowment of 3,250,000 francs annually is inscribed upon the great book of the public debt in favor of the Holy Father."

I have used (with some freedom in translation and compression of statement) the words of this writer, not because he construes the "Law of Guarantees" as I should construe it, nor, if my information be correct, as it has since been construed by either Italian ministers or Italian courts, but because, if he errs, he certainly errs in the law's favor. Taking his statement as true, admitting that the law has the scope and efficacy he claims for it, and that it has been or is likely to be so administered as to best promote its alleged purpose, could this law, or any measure on the model or of the order of this law, satisfy public opinion among Catholic laymen throughout the world? If any great personages, civil or ecclesiastical, without the church or within, either openly or secretly caress the thought that the time has come or will ever come when this question may be answered in the affirmative, I tell them to lay aside these day-dreams; Catholics will never accept this law, or any law of an Italian parliament, as assuring the independence of the Holy See. A law is the act of a sovereign affecting those who are his subjects, or at least, under his legitimate dominion; that a national parliament should pretend to legislate regarding the Holy See involves a denial of its independence. The writer from whom I have already quoted admits this. Replying to the objection that the "Law of Guarantees" had failed of its object, because it had not been accepted by the Pope, he says:

"What need that he should accept it? Was it an offer, a proposition, a project of treaty? Since when have the laws of a sovereign state required acceptance by those whom they concern? True, the law affected the Pope, and even accorded him some privileges of a sovereign within the state. But these privileges were accorded him whether or not he was satisfied with them, whether or not he

saw fit to renounce his temporal power or to retain it in theory and his idea of his rights."

There was indeed, no need that the Pope should accept the law to make it binding on every subject of the Italian crown; if we admit that he is such a subject, then the laws of the Italian parliament bind him as much if he disapprove as if he approve them, but in this admission is contained what Catholics do not, and can and will never admit. The matter of the law goes for nothing; we do not ask for him honors or rank, least of all, money, but freedom; we demand, not that he be granted privileges as though he were a sovereign, but that, since he is and always must be a sovereign, his existing rights as a sovereign be respected. It is not for a parliament of yesterday to confer a patent of honorary precedence on the successor of the fisherman; pomp and external deference, wealth and even personal security have been always those things wherewith the Roman pontiffs could the most readily dispense. Nothing during the most eventful period of their marvelous history is more striking than the contrast between their immense strength as rulers of the church and their little strength as rulers of Rome. At the very time when monarchs came down from their thrones at his bidding, the Pope had not sufficient public force at his command to disperse a mob in the streets of his capital or secure his palace from intrusion, and while the most powerful princes vied to hold his stirrup or lead his palfrey he was subjected in his own city to the grossest insults, often to the most shameful violence, from vulgar demagogues or factious nobles. Crescentius, Arnold of Brescia, Rienzi, Stephen Porcaro, were but a few of the numerous leaders of sedition who, for the most part, might have defied with impunity the papal authority had it not been sustained by the imperial arms. The claims of the Holy See to its temporal domain might be sustained by gifts from the Countess Matilda or Lewis I or Charlemagne or Pepin or, perhaps, even Constantine, but, as an eminent living historian has said, "The Pope had been * * * the victim, not the lord, of the neighboring barons," until, at the very end of the middle ages, these claims were at last enforced by the sword of Cæsar Borgia.

A writer whose ability and whose hostility to the Catholic religion are equally conspicuous has said that when Catholics demand "liberty" for the church, they mean to ask for "power," just as Clarendon pronounced the king of England, "as free and absolute" as any other monarch. Unquestionably liberty implies power.

"No man is free who is not master of himself," and, in civilized society, at least, no man is master of himself who is not, in some sense, a master of others. But while the Pope's power as a temporal ruler, or rather his right to such power, is proven by the teaching of history vital to his liberty as "free and absolute" head of the church, the practical realization of this power is shown equally clearly to be of little moment. It was of vast importance that he be held by Christendom the legitimate sovereign of his domicile; it mattered little that violence from within or without might deprive him for the time being of his lawful dominion. Every pope, to be true to the church and his great office, must inflexibly assert that no living man

was his rightful superior, but it was nothing or very little that he who clung to these lofty pretensions should be besieged in St. Angelo by the Roman rabble or a prisoner in the hands of some rebellious nobleman. The extent and the form of his power has changed often with the changeful ages, but his liberty must be forever the same, for it must be forever "absolute."

It is a less decisive but very grave objection to the "Law of Guarantees" as a *modus vivendi* that acceptance of the position it creates for him would make the Pope *ex necessitate rei* not only a stipendiary of the Italian crown, but the leader of an Italian party. What one parliament can do another can undo, what one has granted another may take away. A party already exists in Italy openly and bitterly hostile to the Holy See, to the church, to religion in any form; if he admits that his liberty depends on the law, then, to protect himself against changes in the law, he must use his only effective weapon—political agitation. In this connection it is well to recall, what seems sometimes forgotten in argument, that no canon of the church requires St. Peter's successor to be found among natives of the land where he was done to death. The conclave is limited to no race or nation in their choice; to practically limit them by assigning to the papacy functions which only an Italian could assume consistently with self-respect or discharge with efficiency would be at least a dangerous innovation.

It has been suggested that the more important provisions of the "Law of Guarantees" might be embodied in a treaty between all the great powers, and thus obtain an international sanction. I think this suggestion looks in the right direction. One day the independence of the Holy See may perhaps be warranted by diplomacy, but when it affords a solution for this great problem, diplomacy will be the mouth-piece of a practically unanimous public opinion throughout the Catholic, I may say, the whole Christian world; a public opinion which Italians will respect, not so much because they fear, as because they share it. A real solution will never be found in bargains between kings and cabinets, nor in the accidents of wars or revolutions. The ultimate sanction for the liberty of the Holy See must be neither military force nor the words of compacts, however solemn, but the universal conviction among good men of all countries, that to violate it would be to wrong mankind.

If I am asked to point out how the independence of the Holy See can be adjusted to the changed conditions of Europe, and especially of Italy, or what form or extent of administrative authority it must exercise to secure that independence, or by what practical measures the desired end can be obtained, I decline the task. *Non nobis tantas componere lites.*

Only those who cannot, or will not, look at all aspects of the existing situation can be confident in their ability to deal with it; and I believe that no one can contemplate the past of the papacy without feeling that it savors of presumption to forecast its future. To those who witnessed successive phases of its mighty conflict with the empire, a widely different outcome to that conflict must have often seemed not probable, merely, but an accomplished fact.

Gregory VII said, almost with his last breath : "I have ever loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die forsaken and in exile," yet the complete triumph of his cause awaited only the fulness of time. In these great questions God's ways are not as our ways; we may not live to see them answered, but we know that in His good season the answer will of a certainty come. Let us await it with the patience of absolute confidence; we are sure that the milk-white hind, so often doomed to death, is yet fated not to die. Nevertheless, we are not to be passive spectators; in this great drama we have our humble part. Crude projects, petulant complaints, sweeping and uncharitable denunciations may embarrass the Holy Father, they cannot strengthen his hands; but we owe him in his trials a heartfelt expression of our loyal sympathy. Catholics do less than their duty if they fail to say, and to say so loudly and plainly that no one can even pretend to mistake their meaning, that the Holy See has been and is gravely wronged; that against this wrong they temperately but firmly protest, and will protest so long as it remains unrighted; that while the freedom of the Holy See is in jeopardy the church is not at peace; and that the sovereign pontiff in vindicating this freedom, not as a privilege to be given or withheld by any earthly power, but as an inalienable right embraced in his divine commission, has and will ever have the unwavering support of all his spiritual children. And for the Catholics of America I say this now and here.

MR. ONAHAN : "Before moving the adjournment of the congress, which is rendered necessary at this time by reason of preparations that are necessary to be made in this hall for the reception to-night, I desire, Mr. Chairman, that there shall go on the records of this convention a vote of thanks to Mr. Bonaparte, for the masterpiece he has just submitted to us, and also to Mr. Shea and Mr. Brownson for their papers." The question was put and the motion was carried, and at 4:30 P. M. the congress adjourned.

SECOND DAY.

The proceedings of the day were begun with prayer by the Most Rev. Archbishop Laflèche, of Three Rivers, Can.

The chairman then said : " Before proceeding with the business of the congress, I wish to make a short announcement. It seems that yesterday in the hurry of forming the committees, it would appear that certain sections of the country were omitted from the list. The chair wishes to state what gentlemen of the congress already know, that this convention must differ materially in every way from a political convention, and one of the greatest points of difference is that before we arrived here the names of the delegates and those who were to be present were entirely unknown to the temporary officers of this body. Therefore it was impossible for us to form the com-

mittees with that pains and care which certainly would have been followed had we known of the presence of the gentlemen in question. I wish to say from the chair, and also on the part of the gentlemen who formed the temporary organization, that there was not the slightest intention to exclude any section of the country from the list of committees, or with respect to the officers of this convention. On the contrary, we were only too glad to welcome them all (applause); and I wish further to state that any section of this country that has felt itself ignored in the matter of committees, or in regard to the vice-presidents or secretaries of this body, if they will kindly send up their names, the same shall be entered upon the permanent record which shall be published in full, of the proceedings of this congress." (Applause.)

MR. M. D. FANSLER, of Logansport, Ind.: "I move that a committee be now appointed by the chair, to consider and report upon the propriety and expediency of holding assemblages of the Catholic laity in every state in this Union annually."

MR. M. J. MCHUGH, of Michigan: "I second the motion."

THE CHAIRMAN: "Gentlemen, you have heard the motion. Will the gentlemen kindly put his motion in the form of a resolution, and it will be referred to the committee on resolutions, under the rules. The unfinished business will now be the order of the day, unless otherwise ordered. The unfinished business is the reading of the papers, and I now have the great honor of introducing to you the Hon. Honoré Mercier, Prime Minister of Quebec, who will read a paper which he has prepared for this congress." (Great applause.)

CARROLL AS A STATESMAN.

PAPER READ BY HON. HONORÉ MERCIER, OF QUEBEC.

I CONSIDER myself particularly honored in being called upon to speak on an occasion which has brought together so many illustrious men. We have assembled in this historic city to do honor to a great prelate, men distinguished in every walk of life, whose names are honored throughout the civilized world, great churchmen and great statesmen, whose wisdom in governing a mighty people is unequalled, warriors whose renown will go down to posterity, speakers and writers whose words are treasured up far beyond the confines of their own country, all alike eminent in their several spheres, many of them coming from foreign lands, but united together by the bonds of their own genius and by their admiration for a great cause and a great name. (Applause.)

That I should be so honored as to be invited to say a few words in such a concourse I regard as an honor paid, not to myself but to

the neighboring country from which I come (applause), and especially to the Province of Quebec, which I represent.

It will not, therefore, seem strange to you, that appearing as I do for a great province in the Dominion of Canada, a province vast in the extent of its fertile land and destined to support a population greater than some of the largest of European kingdoms, I should regard the career of Archbishop Carroll (applause) in his relations to the state rather than in his relations to the church. (Applause.)

Archbishop Carroll was, indeed, a great churchman; he was also a great statesman.

His labors for the church which he loved, and their fruits, which have been told to you in magnificent language; the church which he erected on the free soil of America is to-day one of the greatest churches in the world, counting its members by millions, breathing the air of freedom to its fullest extent, and teaching by precept and example that nowhere is God's work better done and man's happiness better secured than where liberty, grand and universal liberty, is most respected. (Applause.)

Freedom and authority, law and order. the duties of the citizen as well as his rights, that the fullest liberty can exist without license, that liberty brings order and not disorder, that the duty of government is to foster liberty and not restrain it, that well ordered liberty is the surest pillar of authority; these were the lessons that your fathers taught and sealed with their blood. (Applause.)

To support them in their magnificent conception of self-government they had no stauncher ally, no more powerful friend than the great Archbishop Carroll. (Applause.)

These indeed were perilous times! The fate of liberty, the fate of humanity were held in the balance! Had Washington (applause), Franklin, Carroll, and their illustrious brethren failed in the work which God had laid out for them, it would have been a dire calamity to humanity itself! (Applause.)

In Europe absolutism had triumphed; wars of religion, dynastic wars, wars of conquest and ambition had crushed popular aspirations and popular rights. Italy was divided among a few princely houses; German sovereigns sold their subjects to fight in the quarrels of neighboring states; Russia was yet steeped in barbarism; northern Europe was governed by a hand of iron; in every state kingly power was supreme, unfettered by law, unrestrained by opinion.

In France itself it was only certain classes which seemed to think of the duties of power and the rights of subjects, and these thinkers unfortunately were inspired by theoretical ideas, and, alas! in too many cases by irreligious principles, ideas and principles not founded on real life and experience, taking man not in his nature as he was, but with imaginary qualities and imaginary faculties, a man of their own conception and creation, and founding thereon theories of government which were to end in the fearful cataclysm of the French revolution. (Applause.)

In England there was indeed a struggle founded upon truer principles, but it was rather a faint struggle among higher classes against kingly prerogative than of the people for popular rights. The

house of commons was not a popular representative body; it was formed and ruled by the privileged orders, the nobility, and the landed gentry; the penal laws were still in force, the right of popular assembly was denied, combinations of laborers and tradesmen were severely repressed, the right to vote was restricted to a small minority of the population, and it was a half a century afterwards, and more, before the house of commons was to be transferred into a popular assembly, and, following the example of America, the government was to become the government of the masses and not of the classes.

Even the statesmen who then in the house of commons contended for a small measure of popular rights were inspired mainly by their own interests, and would have imposed upon America laws and burdens which they rejected for themselves. If George III desired to govern America by autocratic decrees, he had in the ministry and commons of England a powerful majority to support him in the methods and measures of tyranny.

It was indeed a great crisis for America and the world! Had the ideas which then inspired kings, statesmen, and legislators of the old world prevailed in the new, had your forefathers misunderstood their duty, had they faltered in its performance, tyranny, like a pall, would have spread over the world; and not America alone, but Europe and the civilized world would to-day be struggling to break the chains, to rise out of the slough of despondency to see the Sun of Freedom, which on this day, because of their heroism illumines your continent and sheds its rays wide and far, beyond the oceans which encompass your land. (Applause.)

In that grand and glorious work Archbishop Carroll had no small share. (Applause.) His mind was not warped by old-time beliefs and traditions; broad and expansive, his genius understood that man's intellect and will, being free in conception and exercise, and that the only restraint to be put upon them was that imposed by God's law and required by the condition of man, living in community with his fellow-men, where all would be free to act in the pursuit of happiness, limited only by the rights of others.

Such were the ideas held by Carroll and the illustrious founders of your constitution. Your Declaration of Independence (applause) was a revelation to mankind. Acknowledging that the rights which it proclaimed came from God, as the source of all government and of all authority, it laid down in no uncertain language the principles upon which the greatest amount of liberty should be exercised by the people with the amplest guaranties for order, peace, and security of life and property.

Perhaps no man in that day did more for the American cause than Franklin, and Franklin was the intimate friend of Carroll; in America, in England, in France, Franklin, by voice and pen, was one of the noblest champions of the rights of your country; his diplomatic skill was such that he met and overcame the trained statesmen of Europe, and his genius grasped with unerring judgment the true principles of government; how far the sound learning of Archbishop Carroll, his logical mind, his sense of justice contributed to

instill into the mind of Franklin and his contemporaries those true and grand principles no pen can tell; but we have it proven that he was the trusted counsellor of the fathers of your country, and if his brother Charles, in signing the Declaration of Independence, risked in the service of his country his immense possessions, no less generous was the great archbishop in devoting his great talents, his immense influence and ceaseless labor for the benefit of his fellow-countrymen. (Applause.)

To members of the Roman Catholic Church it was in truth a dispensation of Providence, that Archbishop Carroll did in that day such good service for his country; and that his influence was commensurate with his services; and I might add, equally providential was it for all creeds and faiths in America that his voice was heard.

These were still days of religious persecution; the hatreds roused in Europe by long years of religious dissensions and warfare were not yet allayed; the statutes of every country yet contained laws directed against the liberty of worship; men who denied infallibility to the Roman Catholic Church claimed for themselves the right to control the faith of others, and the world saw the strange spectacle of governments, founded for temporal purposes, making laws for the spiritual wants of the people; not daring to claim that they were inspired by God, yet promulgating doctrines and creeds denying to others the privilege of doing as they were doing themselves in forming their own systems of religious worship.

America was not yet free from these prejudices, and before Carroll's influence had been felt, before his genius had imprinted upon the public acts of his countrymen the stamp of his liberality, the congress of Philadelphia protested against the Quebec act passed by the house of commons of England, which granted freedom of worship to the Roman Catholics of Canada.

This imprudent protest was not without its effect upon the struggle for American independence, and upon Archbishop Carroll himself; when he, with Franklin, Chase, and Charles Carroll, was deputed to Canada to arouse the sympathies of its people in favor of the revolted colonies, they found everywhere that this protest of the Philadelphia congress had indisposed the people; and the French Canadians remained neutral in the struggle—there being only one hundred and fifty in Burgoyne's army—and did not join, as might have been expected, in a war which was to be so fatal to their hereditary enemies. (Applause.)

But this mistake was nobly repaired; when the time came to affirm true principles, to lay down the foundations of your government, the broadest, the largest liberty was proclaimed, and to-day we see in your republic the magnificent spectacle of sincere men, differing in religious belief and practice, united as brethren in their love of country, in their devotion to the principles of civil and religious liberty. (Applause.)

In no cause was Archbishop Carroll more zealous than in the cause of education. True, knowledge in itself will not elevate mankind above the frailties and passions of humanity, but knowledge will tend to make him more refined, more intelligent, more capable

of knowing his duties and rights as well as the duties and rights of others. If to knowledge be joined virtue and religion, we will have quite a perfect man; a man in whom all the faculties, moral and intellectual, have been cultivated. In him shall we find the good citizen, the brave soldier, the honest statesman; under no form of government are virtue and intelligence more necessary than under the republican; there the citizen becomes a statesman, for to his judgment is submitted, as a final issue, the decision of all questions of government; by his vote he participates in legislation, and as he will have understood his duty and performed it, so will the government be, which he and his fellow-citizens will have given to the commonwealth. (Applause.)

No grander service could be rendered to your country than that which the Roman Catholic Church is rendering to the United States on this auspicious occasion in laying broad and deep the foundations of a grand Catholic university; no greater monument could be erected to the memory of Archbishop Carroll, no more splendid celebration of his centenary could be imagined.

In the city hallowed by the name of Washington (applause), in the capital of the freest people on earth (applause), where the interests of sixty-five millions of people, of hundred millions of people, are to be decided by the wisest and best of your land, the Roman Catholic Church, in this year of grace, makes to your country the magnificent gift of a great university, where science and art, where religion and morality will ever find a home, and where your people will learn the grand lesson that loyalty to God means loyalty to the state. (Applause.)

As in old Catholic times, the church had established in England and France, Germany and Italy, universities where the students were counted by thousands, and where all the science of the times was taught by the most learned and most skilful of professors that the age produced, so here in the nineteenth century, in free America (applause), the church continues her old policy, ever the same, of cultivating in mankind the highest faculties in their grandest development, and gives to the students of America a seat of learning where the work of your colleges will be completed, where will be prepared for the future the men who, in the professions, in public life and private life, in pulpit and senate, in conjunction with honorable and honest men of other creeds, are to form the public opinion of your country, who are to educate your fellow-countrymen in the highest and noblest principles of freedom, equality, and justice.

We, on our part, in our province of Quebec, are determined to be guided in public matters by justice; we believe in justice pure and undefiled; justice on all occasions and under all conditions; justice with all its responsibilities and all its consequences; justice not simply for the present and the future, but justice for the past; and where its precepts have been overlooked and forgotten, we believe in going back and repairing injuries done, and discharging debts unpaid; we understand justice as St. Thomas understood it: *Virtus moralis disponens voluntatem ad perpetuo unicuique redden-*

dum jus suum secundum æqualitatem: "A moral virtue disposing the will always to render to others their rights according to equity." (Applause.)

Thus when the Protestant minority of lower Canada demanded the right of educating their children in their own schools, according to their methods and religious ideas, and with their own taxes, the French Canadians and Roman Catholic people, my own countrymen, I am proud to say, hesitated not one moment (applause), but fully and freely granted unto the Protestant minority their separate schools and the absolute right of governing them, as in their opinion it might seem best for them, for the moral and religious welfare of the Protestant population of the country. (Applause.)

In the same spirit, with no intention of undue favoritism, with no notion of overriding the rights of others, but for justice's sake and justice alone *unicuique reddendum jus suum secundum æqualitatem*, we gave back to the Roman Catholic Church, through the order of the Jesuits, the property of which they had been despoiled by the same George III. who would have despoiled your fathers of their liberties and rights.

The Jesuits' estates had been taken from the order, no compensation had been given in return; we therefore considered that we had no true right, no moral right, to retain possession of these estates; true, the law was there we had a legal right to sustain us, no court could have forced us to return the property; but there is a law, a higher law flowing from nature, and nature's God, which told us that we had no moral right to these estates; our title before the courts might be good, but was it good before the supreme law of equity? We thought not; we disdained to accept the doctrine of *fait accompli*, we considered ourselves released by no statute of limitation, by no prescription; finding we had no claim before God, we would not avail ourselves of our claim before man, and of our own free will we made an act of restitution of which we are proud, and which I am confident history will not condemn. (Continued applause.)

We in Canada have done much for education; we are proud of our colleges and our universities; when in years gone by, you had not the facilities which you now possess, how many of your young men sought in Canada the blessings of a Christian education! How many priests and laymen have been sent forth among you by the Seminary of St. Sulpice; how many have left the halls of St. Mary's College, at Montreal, to spread among your people the blessed knowledge which they had acquired in my Canadian home, in my *Alma Mater* with which so many dear associations are entwined in my heart! And if we cannot hope to found in our northern clime such a university as you are now establishing, we can boast that many years ago, as far back as 1852, our bishops and our statesmen had built in the grand old city of Quebec, the Laval University, which has done and is doing in our midst a work by which we all profit and of which we are all proud. (Applause.)

As our colleges have in time past fully and generously given to your people the benefits of education, let me express the hope that

you will be equally generous, and that in the annals of the University of Washington, Canadians will not be strangers; and that as pupils and professors they will ever find a ready welcome, and that the two peoples, united by so many ties already, may find a still closer bond of union, in seeing their children studying the same sciences, in the same halls, under the same masters, for the love of God and for the love of country.

Among the many beautiful poems with which he has enriched your literature, your great poet, Longfellow, has produced one which seems to me most appropriate on this occasion. He applies his address to the ship of the state; I would extend its meaning and apply it to your university likewise. It seems to me that the prosperity of your university is so bound up with the prosperity of your glorious Union, that your love of country is so mingled with your love of religion, that the prayer uttered for the one must of necessity apply to the other.

And to your country as well as to your university, to their union, I would say:

Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what master laid thy keel,
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sullen sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave, and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith, triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee —are all with thee!

(Applause.)

Mr. Edward F. Fagan, of New York: "*Mr. Chairman:* I have a resolution here with respect to the paper just read by the Hon. Honoré Mercier, which I ask unanimous consent to offer at this time."

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the representatives of the American Catholic Congress here assembled tender their cordial greetings to the people of the neighboring government of Canada, offering their grateful acknowledgments and congratulations to her for the warm sentiments of regard and love entertained by her for the people of our

republic, as expressed by the noble utterances of her worthy son and sterling representative, Premier Mercier. (Applause.)

MR. ONAHAN: "I move that the resolution be adopted."

MR. M. W. O'BRIEN: "I second the motion."

(The question was put and the resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.)

THE CHAIRMAN: "Before proceeding with the regular order, which is the reading of the next paper, I have the honor to introduce to you, Mgr. Gadd, who comes here from England as the representative of the distinguished Cardinal Manning, archbishop of Westminster."

Mgr. Gadd said: "*Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:* I do not feel justified in occupying the attention of this convention, when you have so much to do this morning, but this much I must do since the Governor Carroll has called upon me. I desire to express to you the cordial feelings of His Eminence Cardinal Manning, the cardinal archbishop of Westminster, whose representative I have the honor to be, and of Bishop Vaughn, the distinguished bishop of Salford, who has done so much for the colored people on this part of the continent, whom I have also the honor to represent, and to convey to you their feelings of deep respect and heartfelt congratulation on this noble congress at which I am present this morning." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: "The next paper will be read by the Hon. Peter L. Foy, of St. Louis." (Applause.)

MR. FOY: "Permit me one word of explanation before I begin to read the paper. Originally I was appointed to read a paper on 'Charities,' but at a meeting held in Detroit, where there were several bishops present, it was suggested that everything that could be said about charities had been said, and that it would be better for me to take up the subject of philanthropic movements generally. I deferred cheerfully to the suggestion made by the bishops in Detroit, and therefore I read my paper on philanthropic movements in general. I will have to invite your attention to an order of ideas which is practical, and which belongs to the present, and which especially belongs to the masses, more than to the classes." (Applause.)

THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER.

FOURTH REGULAR PAPER, BY PETER L. FOY, OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

TIME, we are told, is the greatest innovator. At present his innovations increase and multiply exceedingly. Human activity (personified as Time in Bacon's apothegm), the great author of

change, grows daily in volume and intensity. The religious, political, social, and industrial systems in which we live, move, and have our being are such highly complex causes that we often fail to see them in their true light. Their proximate effects cannot be discerned with much degree of clearness, nor their secondary ones predicted with any degree of probability. We do not know; we can but guess, and our guesses are various, and at best but faint and flickering adumbrations of coming events. We are seldom able to divine the issue of any great crisis or its permanent results. Nevertheless, all is not hidden. We see the forms of the actual "dominations" looming through the smoke of battle and feel their overwhelming pressure. We catch glimpses now and then of the form and physiognomy of the coming power. Some phenomena are so conspicuous as to catch every eye, and their significance is so obvious that no one can miss it. The two most conspicuous developments of the modern world are the democratic and industrial movements. In the foremost nations, political power is now practically vested in the people. The era of democratic ascendency and rule has set in with irresistible force, and in all human probability will last as long as civilization itself. It is true, we may yet discern here and there on the horizon's rim the golden round of sovereignty on the drooping brow of emperor or king, but it is no longer the symbol of sovereign power. Demos is mayor of the palace, the power behind the throne, greater than the throne itself, which, together with the crown, he will one day send to the national museum, or offer at public sale for the benefit of the national treasury. It is true, also, that he has not yet quite come into his inheritance in the military monarchies—that he is cabined and cribbed, confined and terrorized—encompassed round about with bayonets and tyrannical laws—in those states, but, nevertheless, his advent to supreme power is but a question of a few short years. In America the new order has completely superseded the old. The sceptre passed long ago into the strong right hand of Democracy, and is wielded with vigor and sometimes with wisdom. The name of that sceptre is the ballot. His thunder voice is called public opinion.

If the political state of our own country and that of Europe are not exactly alike at the moment, owing to the survival in the latter of royal, noble, and other titles which are no longer wedded to power or authority, and the domination of physical force embodied in armies, the social life of the rich all over Europe and America is the same. From St. Petersburg and Moscow to Paris and London, to New York and San Francisco, to Mexico and Buenos Ayres, the wealthy classes lead the same luxurious, self-indulgent life, eat, drink, and dress in the same fashion, cultivate the same tastes, pursue the same round of pleasures, and indulge in the same gilded dissipations. The masses in Europe have one or two traits in common—they are all toil-worn and poverty-stricken. Toil-worn and poverty-stricken men and women may be found in America, too. At home as well as abroad we sacrifice to idols, chiefly to Mammon, "the least erected spirit that fell from heaven," whose numerous shrines are thronged with votaries and served with competitive zeal by Jew and gentile.

Looming up in the midst of us, though in lesser proportions, is that other Titan of the age, organized industry. Democracy is the embodiment of all, and therefore includes the multitudinous *personnel* of industry, organized and unorganized, and all other classes; but if the greater power sways the sceptre of legislation, the Demiurgus of organized industry wields a magician's wand. His empire extends over matter and force, both of which he makes do his bidding. Earth and fire and water obey him. The lightning, swifter than light, he has trapped and domesticated. Enriched with a knowledge of the laws of nature, and of the relations of numbers and plane figures, and armed with the tool, and the labor-saving machine, which is a multiple of the tool — equipped with all these, gifts of the Magi, and hierophants of the elements, and the soul of the elements — force — from Prometheus down to Morse and Edison, from Tubal Cain down to the alchemists and Bessemer, from Pythagoras down to Copernicus, Galileo, Newton and La Place, from Euclid and Archimedes down to Watts and the mechanicians, engineers, chemists, and all the other masters of applied science, the hundred-handed giant of organized industry — the ten thousand thousand-handed, rather — achieves new and wonderful things, continually turning inert matter into objects of utility and beauty, the old into the new, the simple into the complex, the few into the many, the little into the great, bringing the far near, running a winning race with the hours, assimilating and harmonizing here, differentiating and specializing there, raising every symbol in mechanical science to a higher and still higher power, recreating or miscreating the surface of the earth, as the case may be, and the things erected on it. He is the poet, the maker in the world of sense, and his alphabet is composed of things, not signs. He is, also, and not seldom, the "Anarch Old," the miscreator, because the divine light of reason, which is the very pulse of the aggregate machine, the cosmic principle which coördinates and unifies the diverse elements and the thousand parts, and gives them organic harmony, is still subject to irruptions of the primeval lawlessness and darkness. Madness may fall on the many, as on the one.

The same highly organized industrial and commercial system which extends over western Europe and Germany, overspreads this country also. The field of skilled labor and manufacturing enterprise is wide and varied, and the living and mechanical forces, and the intellectual activities operating in it and through it are manifold. Their fecundity of production in united action is so great that the statistician's figures in that branch of political economy which deals with production and consumption, are a good deal like the astronomer's, when he tells us of the distances of the heavenly bodies and the number of the invisible stars. This power will grow, for new discoveries will be made and new machines invented. Commerce follows manufactures, in spite of all impediments. What is the culmination and grand result of all those agencies of production and distribution? I answer, The creation and concentration of boundless wealth in the cities, and a corresponding increase, concentration, and condensation of the children of toil at the same

points. Wealth beyond all that fables yet have feigned flows into the spacious reservoirs of Dives. Landlords, bankers, brewers, distillers, railroad owners, mill owners, iron and steel manufacturers, mine owners, patent owners, and various other denominations of monopolists and privileged count their fortunes by millions and tens of millions. Those high priests of Mammon have apparently no higher mental endowment than other men, and the sinister contingent of them have no moral worth, and not a few belong to the category of dicers and blacklegs. The thimble-rigger and the market-rigger are birds of a feather. The millionaires are not a numerous class. Half the wealth of the United States, for instance, belongs, it is said, to 30,000 persons, the other half to the 64,970,000, who have been so largely instrumental in producing the whole. Whether this be so or not the disparity is monstrous, and we may be sure, it is still more so in the old countries. I but repeat a primary precept of the moral law when I say that we all have equal rights to equal or unequal things, as the case may be; and state but a commonplace of political economy when I say that the interests of capital and labor are the same in the long run. But whether by the operation of natural occult causes, or by human design (chiefly by the latter, I believe), the inequality of things may be too extreme because unjust. In the partition of the net product of industry between labor and capital, for instance, either may get more than its proper share, to the detriment of the other necessarily, as well of the general interests. The favored one will prefer immediate to remote gain. Unfair division must have been the rule in the past, or the contrast between the two great divisions of society, the rich and the poor, would not be the astounding spectacle it is. The contrast is too violent. The positive pole is too much of a *plus* and the negative too much of a *minus* quantity. Undoubtedly this condition has been partially brought about by statutory enactments and other artificial means. Centralization is unquestionably a law of the industrial as well as the political movement, but the accelerated speed of the centripetal tendency in recent times is attributable not to natural, but to civil law. Capital and enterprise gravitate to certain favorable points, bringing the multitude in their train. Wealth and population increase, but wealth more than population, and distress more than wealth, The great city lifts its tower-crowned head and becomes a centre of attraction powerful as the mountain magnet in the calendar's tale, a seat of science and art, a scene of fashion, luxury, and pleasure, and too often a hot-bed of licentiousness. The centralizing tendency of things in general is stimulated by the lucrative privileges which wealth never fails to win from the government. The cities are the foci of the new ideas and of the intellectual activities and enterprise which essay to realize them in action and object. They possess subtle powers unknown to the rural population which are periodically called into play in the policy of the state for the benefit of private or corporate interests. Capital, in alliance with the most influential political party, whose leaders it never fails to corrupt, always obtains the franchises and privileges which it covets. The centripetal tendency, as it is revealing itself

at the present, is manifestly the resultant of a composition of forces, not the least potent of which are the acts of congress, the state legislatures, or the city councils. That the maximum of the movement is not yet attained, is deducible from what is happening every day. The formation of "trusts," in which the unit is an aggregation of millions of capital, and the trust itself a confederacy, is the latest development, but who shall say it is the ultimate one? Some of the great manufactories in Europe employ many thousands of hands. M. Schneider, of Crusot, for instance, employs 15,000 men, and Herr Krupp, of Essen, and Sir William Armstrong, the English gun maker, quite as many, if not more, in the production of destroying agencies — guns and munitions of war. There are many other factories of the same kind in France, Germany, and England.

The central movement of capital and industry may be said to extend to sea as well as land. It rides the wave to explore the submarine abysses, and lays thousands of miles of cable on the plateaux, gulfs, and ridges, leagues and fathoms down.

It has substituted steam power for the changing winds. It has multiplied and transformed the transoceanic passenger vessel into a fleet of huge hotels, carrying each 2,000 souls, twenty knots an hour. We may add that it influences domestic traffic as well as *le haut commerce* and manufactures — witness the retail *entrepôts*, with their multifarious assortments, which are crushing out or absorbing the small shops, and the handicrafts.

The creation and concentration of wealth and the collateral movements thus go on incessantly. The miscellaneous multitudes of both sexes, young and old, working in conjunction with machinery moved by steam and kindred motive powers, and supported, supervised, and directed by capital, are of course the agents of all artificial production. The same unjust abnormal relations between employers and employed prevail throughout Europe and America. We witness the same extremes of conditions — the same Serbonian bogs of penury, destitution, and despair on the one hand, and the shining heaps of superabundant gold on the other — the same black shadows and high lights, in the picture of the mercantile and manufacturing countries. The volcanic energies of American life, combined with the natural riches of the land, develop centreity with unrivalled rapidity. We see new cities springing up to adult stature, and old cities (old in our chronology) doubling their population in two or three decades. San Francisco, a great metropolis of 400,000, is about fifty years old. Denver, which is one of the most beautiful cities on the continent, and which promises to be one of the largest, is about thirty years old. The growth of Kansas City, the eyrie of far western enterprise, is not less marvelous. New York is a huge aggregation, numbering perhaps two millions, and next to London, the greatest emporium in the world. Philadelphia counts more than a million; Chicago more than three-quarters of a million, and St. Louis more than half a million. Baltimore, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Louisville, Nashville, Atlanta, and, in short, all the important places, continue to grow. If we look across the ocean we see

London, through her smoke and fog, swarming with her five millions. Paris has more than two millions, Berlin a million and a half, Vienna twelve hundred thousand. There are besides the great manufacturing and trading centres—Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Glasgow, Liege, Antwerp, Bremen, Lyons, and others. All are stored with wealth and clothed with splendor, studded with palaces—studded also with barracks, jails, poorhouses, and hospitals. Dives has also besides his palace in the city, his palace or palaces in the country, surrounded by Elysian fields, where the sea breeze chastens the torrid season, or on wind-swept grouse moor or prairie or mountain crest, or in the midst of his ancestral oaks or remote deer forest. All this is well enough in the abstract, and would be in the concrete if the condition of Lazarus and his tribe, and of the sons of labor, whose touch is the one alchemical virtue that transmutes all things into gold, were free from want, ignorance, and squalor—if health and modest plenty and the homely pleasures dwelt in the narrow cottages as household gods, not visited it at long intervals as flying guests—if provision were made that none should suffer want and that when the time came, the bruised reed should not be broken. The lofty mansion and its surroundings, the foliage and floral bloom, indigenous and exotic in the vernal season or when October clothes tree and shrub with russet, purple, crimson, and gold, which the envious gust strips off and shrivels and withers as he showers them on the sward; the light and shade and brooding quiet, and all the other charms of garden and woodland, have salutary greetings for spectator as well as owner, and for soul as well as sense, and like the Pleiades above shed sweet influences, as indeed, according to the high authority of the poets,* every wild flower and forest tree is capable of doing, if we are but in the right mood to receive them. The abuse of riches, the unequal apportionment of profits which are the elements of riches, are the grievances of which the commonalty justly complain, as they are the prime incentives to those spoliation schemes and socialistic movements which aim at the confiscation of landed property and the total destruction of the existing order of things.

Learning and science, letters and arts, are largely indebted to private wealth; so is every form of charity. Individual endowment has founded and will continue to found many a famous school, many a spacious hospital and asylum, many a noble church, many a treasure house of natural history, sculpture, and painting. Even when spurred on by selfish motives, private and corporate wealth do many things that contribute to the general culture and well-being, redeeming waste lands, planting new industries, importing superior breeds of cattle, horses, and sheep, importing beautiful statues and pictures, useful and ornamental plants; building railroads, telegraph lines, palace hotels, and "floating palaces." I neither meditate nor pronounce any anathema on riches, which is but another name for capital — an indispensable factor of production and the well-spring

*See the opening of "Endymion" and almost any part of the "Excursion."

of wages. I maintain that the growth of capital ought to accompany or exceed the growth of population, if the interests of labor are to be advanced. If the amount of active capital declines, absolutely or relatively, a lower wage is inevitable. I contend that rich men, and a certain proportion of very rich men, that is, capitalists, are an essential element of the body politic, because an essential element of progress. Without knowing it, perhaps, they translate a good deal of poetry into fact and object and turn ideal scenes into visible idyls, or they "decree" them done in the masterful manner of the eastern potentate,† which is practically the same thing. They hold the keys of the workingman's paradise — permanent, remunerative, invigorating employment — but unfortunately, at the best of times, the gates are held ajar, and but comparatively few of the working men are admitted. I do not deny that the rich are getting richer, but I do deny that the poor are getting poorer. On the contrary, the circle of comfort, competency, and intelligence is widening slowly — too slowly — though the outer darkness may be dense as ever, and vexed as ever with weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth.

The questions now before the American people (they are less political than social) are the most important since the slavery question was decided. In England, the combined socialist and labor movement is the most important since the era of the "Great Rebellion;" in France, since the revolution; in Germany, since the Napoleonic conquest. The accusation and indictment which the proletariat urge in the forum of all nations is that the capitalists, in the broad sense of the definition, take or get more than their due proportion of the fruits of the earth and all industry, and in addition absorb the whole unearned increment, whether coming from land or other monopolies. I am bound to say the charge is but too well founded. All the facts and phenomena testify to it. How else could there be squalid misery and an infinite amount of it at one end of the scale and excessive riches at the other? It will not do to attribute the condition of the poor to themselves — to their improvidence, idleness, and intemperance, etc. The proletariat, as a body, are not demoralized, for they are willing and able to work, and live by work when it can be got. Their occasional lapses from sobriety and thrift, and the dissipated habits of some, are in no small degree caused by their wretched, sordid environment, which has been built around them in iron circles by the same blind destiny that flung the golden fleece round their antipodes in the social sphere. If the question of morality should be raised between the two, the debate would never end. Each has its own sins to answer for, and those of each may be put into the scale against the other's; but when the few, trailing their vast possessions, are weighed against the naked many, the landless, the moneyless, the thirty thousand against the twice thirty millions, the scales no longer balance. The thousands, loaded down with the world's goods, are heavy, the millions, light. The gold outweighs the flesh and blood and, *a fortiori*, capital outweighs labor. To adjust or readjust the balance, to establish a

†Kubla Khan.

permanent equilibrium between capital and labor, or more broadly, between the millionaires, the toiling masses, and the public at large, without infringing on the just rights of any is the chief problem of political science in this, our day and generation. The undue preponderance of one class in public affairs and society movements generally, like the unconstitutional preponderance of one branch of a government at the expense of the others, is the fruitful cause of morbid unrest, chronic agitation, and revolutionary change. The people are instinctively opposed to plutocratic ascendancy more than to any other, because plutocracy never hesitates to employ bribery for the attainment of selfish ends, and leans on corruption as its most powerful auxiliary. Furthermore, undue aggressive prominence, inordinate covetousness, loud ostentation, overweening pride, and frivolous exclusiveness — the most marked characteristic of the *nouveaux riches* — are universally disliked, and the caste themselves bitterly envied and loudly cursed. Class pride and the vices inherent in caste have brought down old aristocracies, and are darkly dangerous to the new in the new democratic and industrial era. To restore and maintain the equilibrium of the different powers of the state, of the different classes of the population, is simply to restore and maintain the healthy condition of the state and secure the stability and improvement of its institutions. This rule applies to the natural body as well as the body politic. The harmonious workings of the different organs, the maintenance of the equation of waste and nutrition, are the conditions of health. The frequent disturbance of these normal relations — the feebler action of some organs, the excessive activity of others — means disordered functions, the decay of the organism, and dissolution. To wisely coördinate the special and public interests, to place and maintain each part of the community in its proper place and in just relation to the whole, or, more correctly, to repress all class usurpation, whether the class be workers or employers, is, I repeat, the *desideratum* of the new statesmanship and the problem of the age. Mere party politics are passing out of date into the limbo whither have fled the ghosts of slavery and the alien and sedition laws. The democracy has the severest of its Herculean tasks before it, for the great social question which is the integral of the labor question, the educational question, the state charities question, and the temperance question will dwarf all other issues, and on the satisfactory solution of it the welfare and healthy progress of the American people depend.

After we have seen the earth and the glory of it from the top of a high mountain, as it were, after we have gazed on one famous metropolis after another, with all its treasures, on the cloud-capt towers, the gorgeous palaces, on the gardens of Epicurus and the groves of Academe, on the flaming blazonry which pride, pomp, and luxury fling from their lofty battlements, after we have noted all this and every other dazzling spectacle that the luminous panorama unfolds, and gloried in the more substantial achievements of skilled labor, science, and art, in the innumerable inventions of our wondrous mother age, in all the triumphs of our material civilization, can we yet dare to cry out from the watch tower, All is well? He were a

false sentinel who uttered that cry. No! all is not well. The nations are smitten with organic ailments, the consequences of those very policies, pursuits, and ambitions which in making them populous, haughty, and opulent, have made them more corrupt, more formidable to one another, and most dangerously oppressive to their own citizens or subjects. In Europe to-day there are millions of armed men, idling away their time, passing dreary lives in camps and barracks and vessels of war, who have to be supported by the working people, because they themselves toil not, neither do they spin. In time of war these millions mount to twelve or fifteen and their business then is to destroy life and property and as an immediate consequence ravage the conquered country. Those immense armaments on sea and land and the wars have created and continue to create immense public debts which devour the earnings of the workman and entail a perpetual mortgage on posterity, which means on the working people, generation after generation. There was a probability at one time that all the nations of Christendom would constitute a Christian confederation and that international disputes would be settled by the arbitration of the Apostolic See. But the Reformation rooted out that sublime idea and planted international discord and the seeds of perennial strife in its place. We are slowly learning that war, though sometimes necessary, is a calamity and a curse; that military grandeur is too costly a luxury, and that military glory is dearly bought, without counting the families made desolate, or the limb-shattered survivors and permanent invalids. Society in truth is fundamentally disordered, as we cannot help seeing. The physical ills have their sources in the pride and ambition inherent in empires and military states and the ignoble passions and licentious appetites of our nineteenth-century aristocracies and their satellites and sycophants. Mammon has our aspirations and energies in thrall, and luxury and sensuality follow in his train. Where these dwell and reign all the powers of the nether world congregate.

Those renowned cities and marts, seas of light apparently on the earth's surface—man-made constellations, so to speak—abound in maelstroms of poverty, pestilence, and crime. Famine and his evil brood, drunkenness and his still more evil brood stalk through street and alley, night and day. Blameless indigence and tottering old age are doomed to the haunts and hovels—the cellars and the garrets—wherein leprous disease and habitual criminality make their squalid lairs, because there is no shelter outside the workhouse or the lazar-house. The magnitude of the urban pauper element is an unknown quantity, and so is the number of charities, religious and voluntary, including the host of alms givers, which try to cope with it but fail to do so, because the sooty flood of Acheron, welling up from bottomless depths, overflows every breakwater. The charities and charitable institutions of all kinds, at home as well as abroad, are always overtasked. In the sum, they are utterly inadequate to meet the calls on them. Paupers, mendicants, criminals of all grades—the outcasts of both sexes—constitute a considerable proportion of our own civic populations. The criminal classes are

largely recruited from the wandering tribes of the streets—the loafers, hoodlums, tramps, etc. Next to them come the petty peddlers, and pickers-up of unconsidered trifles, of which the chiffonier, the match seller and the gutter snipe are the types. Far outnumbering both are the hordes of unorganized, unskilled labor—able-bodied men, who ask at first but for employment, which they do not always get, and which when they do get is generally but casual, and whose condition at best is precarious because sickness or enforced idleness reduces them to absolute destitution, and these contingencies are frequent in their lives. They stand at all times on the brink of the abyss, and fall into it like the travellers on lower the bridge of life in the vision of Mirza. In the best of times they are compelled to accept the minimum wage which the law of supply and demand prescribes. This applies also to the branches of skilled labor, especially to the work of men and women and children in sweating shops and factories. All those are "objects of charity," but not necessarily entitled to alms all the time, or support at the expense of the public. They are, nevertheless, entitled to the protection and provident care of the state, because they are unable to protect or always provide for themselves. Special legislation for any class, except the classes which by reason of their condition are incapable of protecting themselves, is radically vicious. Hence it is that I leave out of account the various catagories of skilled labor—the artisans, the artificers in the precious metals, engineers, printers, mechanics, the house building, house decorating and house furnishing trades—in short, all who minister to cultivated tastes or the special wants of the rich, because in this country, at least, their remuneration is liberal, and if it be not, the remedy is in their own hands, and what they can do for themselves they ought not to ask the state to do. They are for the most part intelligent, provident, and independent, and cannot by any strain be included in the proletariat. They are, furthermore, well organized in trades unions and other societies, and considering their voting power and their general unity of action, or at least potential unity of action, they should be and undoubtedly are well able, if they will, to protect themselves. Later I shall have a little to say about the interests common to them and the whole labor element. Excluding them and the craftsmen who work on their own benches, and are masters of their own time, yet how many are the wage earners! Take first the greatest of all industries, agriculture. The men and women who work for daily or monthly hire in the fields from morning till night through the revolving year, though the sky be as brass and the earth as iron, are numerous as the sands of the sea. But because of its very immensity the world over, we will turn away in despair from that spectacle to lesser and local fields of labor. The railroad employes—the numerous hands engaged on the lines, and in the yards, depots, and machine shops—are in constant danger, and, in fact, are well nigh decimated every year. To prepare the way for them, came the pioneer and the road maker with pick and shovel, whose bones moulder in nameless graves on prairie and mountain:

——— the forgotten dead
Whose dauntless hands were stretched to grasp the rein
Of Fate and hurl into the void again
The thunder-hoofed horses rushing blind,
Earthward along the courses of the wind.

Consider the millions who serve before the mast, who are also environed by danger, which danger is aggravated by the cupidity of the ship owners. They too have a life of hardship and privation, and are disqualified for service and therefore qualified for the poor-house at a comparatively early age. Consider next the multitudes delving in the depths of mines or performing equally dismal tasks in the equally stifling atmosphere of mills and factories, or before furnace fires, or on the sweating benches of the stitchers! What catastrophes and fatalities are daily recounted — explosions, conflagrations, collisions, inundations, shipwrecks — causing wholesale loss of life, the victims, ninety-nine out of the hundred, being the working men and women. Unremitting toil, broken-down constitutions, poverty and gloom are the guerdons of the millions.

It was not always so, and should not be so. If we continue to let ourselves drift on the turbulent flood, at the mercy of winds and currents; if we continue to make *Laissez Faire* and *Laissez Aller* our mottoes and sovereign rule of conduct, we shall inevitably be driven on the rocks at last, though for obvious reasons the catastrophe is not imminent. To forecast the future we have but to draw plain deductions from the state of things, prevailing in other countries and from the census tables — those of other countries as well as our own. If we would see as in a magic mirror the image of our full-grown and full-blown selves, but only a miniature image, we have but to look across the wave.

This is why I try to keep Europe, and England especially, constantly in view. The conditions existing there are fast appearing here on a larger scale. The England of to-day, the richest country in the world, the most extensive empire, the first in commerce and manufactures, is the foreshadow and simulacre of the United States of the twentieth century, unless in the meantime we introduce new regulating and regenerating principles into our polity. We may take London as the epitome of England, and the highest type of the nineteenth century development. It is the supreme result of the action and interaction of industrial and mercantile forces, whose productiveness have been dwelt upon and whose centripetal tendencies I have pointed out. The wealth harvested there annually is almost beyond computation. The highest living authority in English economics estimated last year the indebtedness of other countries to English capitalists at over twelve thousand millions of dollars. It is increasing every day. English syndicates are making lavish investments all over North and South America, especially in this country — all over Asia, too. They are investing everywhere, even in savage Africa. The fountains are overflowing and the golden flood has to seek fields that may be made to fructify in farthest foreign parts. Yet in that very London there are 100,000 paupers in receipt of indoor or outdoor relief, and half

as many criminals, mendicants, and prostitutes. The noisome nether world of the modern Babylon is as extensive as the upper regions of wealth and splendor. That foul abyss, with all its yawning gulfs, deep opening into lower deep, like the successive circles of the *Inferno* — that black Gehenna, whose dragon breath turns the sun to blood and poisons the spiritual atmosphere of all nations, is a fact not less stupendous and not less *en evidence* than the dazzling riches spread out above, By mysterious, but by no means inscrutable or irrepealable laws, these two worlds are *directly related as cause and effect*, and in both of them nature breeds perverse all monstrous, all abominable things. The recurring horrors of Cheapside make humanity shudder, but the recurring revelations of aristocratic profligacy and insensate luxury prove that immorality pervades the one as well as the other. In that very London there are milions who have never darkened a church door, and who have no more sense of the supernatural than the beasts that perish. The propaganda of atheism has from of old its chief seat there, and in its latest form of agnosticism is more active than ever. Religion withers and dies in the Stygian atmosphere of the pits that underlie the great city, and even in the atmosphere above when too heavily loaded with the fumes of the unwholesome incense burned to Mammon. Nor when we emerge from the total darkness into the middle region of unskilled and intermittent labor, in the English capital is the prospect much improved. The number of common laborers and doers of odd jobs in and out of work, of "slaveys," household drudges, and sewing women of all kinds is enormous. Two hundred thousand laborers were on a strike a few weeks ago to get *twelve* instead of *ten cents* an hour, and the principal obstacle they had to overcome was the pressure from without of hungry hordes of their own class who stormed to get in to fill their vacant places. In the East-end sweating shops of the clothing houses, men and women stay on their benches during a working day of from fourteen to sixteen hours. They have no breakfast or dinner interval, and after all. their earnings are but a miserable pittance, and but partially serve to sustain life.

This would sound incredible if it were not for the statements of numerous witnesses recently examined before a parliamentary committee.* Even the higher grades of skilled labor, as well as agricultural labor, have frequent occasion to exclaim, "How full of briars is this working day world!" The competition for employment is severe, the wages low, and the working hours too many. The spectre of indigent old age haunts the hearth of the European artisan.

What is true of one country in the wide circle of industrial and mercantile states is true of all; what is true of London is true of Paris, Vienna, Berlin, and sundry other places. Our own metropolitan cities differ but little from the foreigner, and are very much alike. Can we wonder then that this poverty-smitten labor element which is the principal factor of production—production the

* Lord Dunraven's committee of the house of lords.

sum and synonym of all wealth—moves and murmurs throughout! So far it has found no remedy for its wrongs but the rude and uncertain one of strikes—a cure, even when it is a cure—often worse than the disease, for capital and labor and the public suffer alike while the strike "is on," but the workman most, because it impairs his *morale*. The incessant labor agitations, extending far and wide, are signs of serious import—symptoms of profound disquietude and disturbance at the very foundations of society. Let us not lay the flattering unction to our souls, that because the American people are free, prosperous, and powerful, we are therefore exempt from the pains and penalties incurred by the violation of economic and moral law. The same causes produce the same effects in all degrees of latitude and longitude and under all forms of government. We, too, have paupers, criminals, mendicants, and incapables of many kinds, and their numbers are not decreasing. The tramp I fear is perennial as well as ubiquitous. The street Arab, the "hoodlum," and the "tough" are products of our city life, and they differ but in name from their congeners on the other side. The communist, the anarchist, the nihilist walk our streets and boldly threaten the magistrate as well as the capitalist. Is it not manifest that if we would escape the evils incidental to the existing order, and involved in it to its very core, we must reform and regenerate it? There is, however, no immediate cause of alarm. Pessimism, which flourishes in Europe, is the religion of despair, and that doctrine cannot flourish for many a day on American soil. We have ample room and verge enough wherein to plant and plough; we are yet but twenty-five to the square mile, and the superabundance of our natural wealth in lands, forests, and minerals will save us for a generation or two from any dire eventuality, though certainly not from serious internal commotions. We can now redress our steps and begin to move toward that new world, which is the old restored to pristine health and beauty. Man is a free agent, and the Creator offers him the privilege of carrying out the divine plan which is emblazoned in lines of light on all his works, so that he who runs may read. We generally prefer to follow our own, however, which is the cause of all our woes. But though no impending cataclysm overshadows us like a thunder cloud nor hurtles in the "caverns under," like the birth-throes of the earthquake, there are dangers to be encountered, victories to be won, evils to be subdued or eradicated.

To ameliorate the condition of the toiling millions, to breathe a kindlier atmosphere into the hospitals, the asylums, the bastiles of pauperdom, and even the felon's cell; to reorganize the public charities on a broader basis and in a more liberal spirit, to save the honest workman and his family and even the forlorn tramp from hunger and cold, without fatally wounding in his person the dignity of human nature, to gather up the orphans, the foundlings, the waifs and strays of the streets and alleys, and house and train them in knowledge and industry—these with the more obvious duties of relieving the sick and the infirm are the tasks of charity, public and private, and meet subjects for philanthropic enterprise. In their

execution the state should take the first place. If we appropriate so many thousands or hundreds of thousands annually for the support of public charities and for the toil-worn wrecks of those huge industrial Juggernauts that crush the marrow of the bones, we must not whisper even to ourselves that we are generous. We merely pay a debt or rather a portion of it. Not a state in the Union, not a city in any state is sufficiently equipped to meet the demands of charity—demands which are undisputably just and nearly always cries of necessity. That the state is bound to the performance of the offices of charity within its proper sphere is a proposition which it is not necessary, I presume, to demonstrate in a Catholic congress. In the beginning the church was a community, say rather a family, in which all things were in common and fraternal love reigned at the board. The type still exists, thank God, in our monasteries. Later, when relieved from heathen tyranny, the church created the organized charities, which have come down to us through sixteen hundred years. Until the Reformation, she took the offices of charity on herself and performed them only too liberally, but she was robbed at that time of all she had within and without, which was mainly the patrimony of the poor. The state was now obliged in self-defense to become a public almoner, but thus far it has proved a poor substitute for the church. In nothing was the change wrought in human nature by the religion of Jesus Christ, more remarkable than in what is now called altruism or care for others. Before the Gospel was preached the hearts of men were as hard as the nether millstone. The Roman, the Greek, the Jew, and the barbarian were all alike cruel and pitiless. Society and the individual were encased in adamant, as it were. The condition of the civilized world then was analogous to the condition of the northern hemisphere itself during a certain geological period. The time was when Ursa Major in his nightly round saw nothing on this globe but snow and ice, the aspiring flame of subterraneous fires and the deadly brightness of them—when the rivers were as solid as the mountains and nothing was fluid but the volcano's incandescent overflow, when the coasts were planted with forests of icebergs, destined in after times to fertilize distant lands, and throw a cooling breath on equatorial seas. But now by the fiat of Him who poured them from the hollow of his hand, the great ocean currents began to move from the tropic towards the pole. The deep blue river of the Gulf Stream, whose banks are the cleft Atlantic, impregnated by the perpendicular ray, tempered the American climate on its destined course to Europe, near to which it bifurcated. The life-giving "horned flood" swept the shores of island and continent from Scandinavia to Asia Minor, creating the temperate zone. Dry land appeared once more, and mosses and green grass, the birch, the pine, the oak, the cereal plant followed in brief succession, and the laurel, the myrtle, the olive, the vine, and the daffodil, the daisy and the rose. The nightingale was heard in the grove and the lark in the sky. In like manner, as soon as the river of life began to flow in the moral world, a mighty change began. Sympathy took the place of cynicism, chastity of sensuality, and the love of our neighbor of the inordinate love of self. The eternal brotherhood of man

dawned on the hitherto benighted mind of man. The charity of the early Christian embraced the race. Stranger and enemy ceased to be synonymous terms, the leper, the Magdalene, the cripple, the lunatic, the dumb, the blind, and the destitute were the chosen objects of Christ's miraculous beneficence. The church, following his example, as in duty bound has from the beginning made the same pitiable class of beings her constant care. Wherever the new religion took root, hospitals, asylums, orphanages, schools, and universities speedily grew up. An ampler ether, a diviner air came down. New life was breathed into letters, science, and art. The basilica arose, radiant within and without with marbles and mosaic paintings. Roof and aisles resounded with hymns and canticles which still delight the profane as well as the pious. The literary treasures of Athens, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome were preserved, copied, interpreted, and divinely illustrated. Paradise bloomed once again within the hallowed precincts of the cloister and the cathedral close. But charity was then as well as now the greatest attribute of the church, as it is the greatest of the virtues, for it wraps all nations, tongues, and conditions in one supernatural flame, exalting and transfiguring the meanest as well as the highest. The grateful glow of it falls on the dumb brute, and literally as well as figuratively tempers the wind to the shorn lamb, and lightens the load of the beast of burden. The region of darkness and mystery is the scene of the indomitable flight of the angel of charity. Faith may go, hope may go, but charity stays, and, to snatch a human soul from the enemy, will dare to brush with her bright pinion the very gates of hell. It follows that the separation of the unfortunate into "deserving" and "undeserving" objects of compassion and relief is an unjust and unwarrantable one. Philanthropy may recognize the distinction, but charity does not. On the contrary, the less deserving, in the secular sense, the more ardently does charity clasp the suppliant to her bosom, for the sufficient reason that succor is most needed there. The worship of humanity, the altruism of the Comptists, is but a pale and petty reflection of the starry blazon of the religion of Christ, which shines full-orbed in the diadem of the church. There is no objective reality in the benevolent part of the fantastic system of the French philosopher. Where are the eleemosynary institutions of the Positivists? No doubt they inculcate philanthropic sentiments and in that way give encouragement to philanthropic movements in general, but in itself Positivism is as barren as the sand dunes of the seashore or the desert. The Materialists proper are opposed to every form of charity and philanthropy. They would supersede the higher ethic law which charity fulfills, by the purely physical law, which ordains that all who fail in the battle of life, or fall out on the march, should be left to their fate. Darwin's doctrine of the survival of the fittest and Hobbes's theory that the inevitable state of the individual, in civilization as well as savagery, is a state of internecent war with his fellow-man are the gospel of the sect. Give the earth to the victors, to the strongest the fittest! The rest are cumberers of the ground and should be swept off with all convenient dispatch! But the race is not always to the swift nor the

battle to the strong, and the fraternity of men is a spiritual and material fact in the Christian system, and, I make bold to say, a potentiality of the new politics. Charity delights in redressing the inequalities and curbing the ruthlessness of nature. The moral law as formulated in revelation is after all the supreme law in human affairs Logically carried out the theories of the Materialists would sanction the infanticide of the Chinese, the Red Indian abandonment of the aged, and the abominations of sexual depravity. Fortunately the supernatural element is still found in the domestic atmosphere and the statute books, for it is the salt which preserves the race from corruption. The existence of public charities throughout the land, imperfect and inadequate though they are, is proof that the supernatural is still with us, even in public affairs.

The powers of the state are commensurate with its duties. It possesses the taxing power which is the vital thing in working out the problems of the education question, the labor question, and the charities question. The three are most intimately related, but the last can never be placed on a proper footing or have fair play until the two others are permanently adjusted, which will not be until they are fairly adjusted Though her ministrations shall continue whether the state act or not, yet it is only when the state has done its part, that voluntary charity can hope to be mistress of the work she has to do—a work that will end only with the consummation of all things, for the world, the flesh, and the devil shall not fail to take toll of the generations on their pilgrimage to eternity. The enemy shall continue to sow tares among the wheat. The vicissitudes of fortune, the tragedies of passion shall continue to leave their marks on character and life. Catastrophes, natural and human, shall continue to strew earth and ocean with wrecks and ruins; and "the blind Fury with the abhorred shears" will not hold from slitting the thread of life, separating husband and wife, robbing children of their parents and parents of their children. The sphere of charity we may be sure will not be circumscribed within too narrow bounds by the action of the state, however broad and beneficent that action may be. To the end of time she shall—

> ———see ill sights
> Of madding passions mutually inflamed;
> Must hear humanity in fields and groves,
> Pipe solitary anguish; or must hang
> Brooding above the fierce confederate storm
> Of sorrow barricaded evermore
> Within the walls of cities.

Her brooding is ever brief, for action is the law of her life, as love its inspiration and motive power.

Charity apart, I venture to say that the labor movement, which at first sight seems a selfish struggle between classes, takes the foremost place among those developments which promise to reduce the sum of human misery and promote the comfort and well-being of the greatest number. It is, therefore, in substance philanthropic, and in its philanthropic aspect it demands patient and candid examination by this enlightened assembly. The poverty of the laboring popula-

tion, and the boundless possession of the capitalists and the millionaires, are each the complement of the other. For the proper consideration of the cause now on trial between these two divisions of society let us for the moment eliminate the intermediate classes, who have neither poverty nor riches, but who have not to earn their bread in the sweat of their face. Though I sin against the literary canon by repetition, I will say once more that the same laws and systems which have precipitated a plethora of wealth among the capitalists have denuded and drained the masses and keep them in that abject condition. The blood has all gone to the head, leaving the hands and feet famished and the body itself feeble and emaciated. England and America have stretched out their hands to the ends of the earth in quest of cheap labor. First the coast of Africa was explored and the kidnapped negro was brought in. The convicts of the mother country and prisoners of war were sent over here for a long time, and forced to work under the lash. The Cromwellian-conquered Irish were seized by thousands and transported to the plantations. When those cruel methods fell into disuse, we began to court voluntary immigration. We sent out emigration agents to Europe to entice recruits for the exhausted ranks of domestic labor, by the offer of bounties and the promise of unlimited possessions in a land flowing with milk and honey, any number of acres of which was to be had for the asking. We are still doing so, it seems. We have crossed the Pacific as well as the Atlantic on that quest. We have brought the Chinese here by virtue of the Burlingame treaty which was negotiated to the music of cannon, and now we are driving them out and treating them generally in a way which prints a blot on our escutcheon. We have let in the Mormon and his many wives. We annexed a large portion of Mexico with its alien population, not because we liked them, but because we coveted their lands, and they were virtually *adscripti glebæ*. We are still yearning for cheaper labor, and Vermont, we are told, is on the point of sending an expedition to the Baltic, to induce a migration hither of Danes, Swedes, and Norwegians. Not yet content, our capitalists are smuggling in skilled labor, but why they should not be permitted to import it openly as long as the present system lasts, and both kinds, skilled and unskilled, if unsolicited, are freely admitted, is an anomaly evolved from our protective system. In addition, we have killed off the Indian, after seizing his lands, because we could not make him work. We made an environment for him of "the blessings of civilization" which outraged every precept of morality, and not being able to live in that corrosive cortex in that shirt of Nessus, he had to give way to the border ruffian and his ally, the whiskey smuggler, in conformity with the law and the prophets of materialism. The hunger and thirst for riches, the *auri sacra fames*, never raged with fiercer flame in any bosoms than our own. Never, in any age or among any people was it more the ruling passion than it is here and now and always has been.

The typical result is before us in the immense conglomeration of London, in which hell opens her hundred mouths, and of which our own cities are so many microcosms.

The liability of the employer or public carrier for the injury or death of the employe or other victim, though partially recognized in law, is continually challenged in the courts to the scandal of American jurisprudence. Every claim of this kind is contested, entailing all the penalties of tedious litigation on the unfortunate claimant. Some summary process for overcoming what is practically a denial of justice by railroad and other corporations is urgently needed. It is estimated that the number of railroad fatalities annually is about 2,500. The serious accidents are many times that number. Over 3,000 seafaring men on English ships (or one out of every sixty) are drowned every year, owing to the overloading, undermanning, and neglect of repairs.* We do not lose so many because our ocean-going marine is such a speck that no binocular glass can find it on the high seas. Is it not self-evident that the widows and orphans, and the maimed and disabled should receive ample and immediate compensation from those in whose service life and limb were lost? That accumulated wealth and capital, besides furnishing liberal compensation in cases of fatality and dismemberment should also contribute to the support of the men whose disabilities and infirmities have been incurred in the production of it, is a proposition that cannot well be disputed, and we see that in one great country at least it is the groundwork of a new system designed to meet the necessities of the working classes, when disability from whatever cause, accident, illness, or old age, supervenes. The plan adopted by the German government is insurance by the joint contributions of employers, employed, and the state, each contributing a third. But manifestly the premiums ought to be paid exclusively by the employers, because then the tax would be added to the price of the article produced or deducted from the compensation for the service performed. The workman, if he contributes, should have the right to withdraw the amount of his contributions at stated periods. There are 3,861,560 skilled workmen, of whom 259,977 are railroad men, now insured in Germany. There are also 6,978,579 agricultural laborers insured. Denmark and Austria have begun to establish similar systems. This Bismarckian measure is to me an economic fact of the deepest significance — a precedent, I would say, of inestimable value. It is a partial reading at least of the terrible Sphinx riddle of the age. The German law does not, indeed, cover the whole ground, but it brings the whole ground within the domain of "practical politics." An insurance policy of similar character here would be a matter exclusively between the employers and the workmen. The state should do nothing more than exercise the same supervision over it that it does over insurance in general.

The state recognizes its philanthropic duties, but only in a half-hearted, niggardly spirit. As a matter of fact many of the burdens which properly appertain to the state are shifted on the cities, whose local charities in addition are abused by the selfishness of rural communities, which like some foreign countries are but too well

* This statement was repeatedly made at the Seaman's Congress held last month in Cardiff.

inclined to expatriate their paupers and imbeciles. But state philanthropy should not be confined to the erection and maintenance of some asylums. These are of course indispensable, but other institutions are needed. No outdoor relief of any kind is provided in any case for any one. The hospitals, which are too limited in number, for the most part belong to the city, or private foundations, or religious charities. Prisons and reformatories are not charities, but public safeguards, but charity should find free entrance to them and all other penal institutions, for nowhere else are her visits more needed.

Apart from charities public and private, and the labor movement, the philanthropic activities of the day include the sanitary, the temperance, the educational, and the peace (international) movements. The last may have and I am sure has our sympathy, but it has not the practical interest for us that it has for the European peoples. With regard to labor, it is evident, if I have not unhappily spoken in vain, that not only the condition of the proletariat, but public policy demands a more equitable distribution of the joint productions of land, labor, and capital. In no country, as far as I can see, is there any decentralizing action in the regions of industry and commerce at all comparable to or commensurate with the centralizing movement. Coöperation would furnish the panacea, perhaps, but that system is but of very limited extent or application thus far, and is evidently of too slow growth to meet the exigencies of the day. The everlasting cry is for more trade, increased output, new markets! Not a word is said about a just dispensation of profits. Our manufactories, by some political art and craft, are now to overleap all tariff barriers and shake their cornucopiæ over Central and South America. So far so good, but the gains are to flow back in the same old channels, and settle in the same old reservoirs of the plutocrats. If we are yet so backward in economics and social dynamics, or let us say in scientific politics, as to be incapable of starting an outflow by automatical agencies the equivalent of the inflow, or in other words, if we are yet incompetent to provide for a fair division of the fruits of industry between the different factors of production, we are at least able to provide provisional or empirical relief for the evils of the existing state of affairs — for the maladies most in sight — for the eruptions and spasms which attest the disordered constitution. First of all, we should extend education. Education is not a remedy for every evil under the sun, and a purely secular education is seriously, even vitally, deficient, for it furnishes no sanction for morals or conduct, and good conduct is more than half the battle of life; but any training of the mental faculties is so much added to the ability of the individual. Free night schools for adults, free reading rooms, free libraries, and free technical schools for industrial training now that apprenticeship is a thing of the past, should be established in our cities, and free museums of art, antiquities, and natural history in our metropolitan cities and in all high schools and universities. Mechanics' institutes would advance the cause, but these should be founded and maintained by the mechanics themselves. All these things would promote popu-

lar education and morally would stand as a chain of fortresses against the saloon, the dance-hall and the low variety show. But physical education and public hygiene should also have a place in the new system. Free swimming baths, gymnasia, and open spaces abounding in shade and shelter, should be established wherever needed. Skilled and unskilled labor have an equal interest in these important matters, as they also have in the sanitary condition of their dwellings and the shops and establishments in which the workmen congregate. If the workmen used their ballots to good purpose every shop and every factory, every dwelling, however humble, every living room in the tenement house, would be perfect in plumbing, sewerage, and ventilation. Boards of health and building inspectors pay very little attention to what they deem small matters. It is to be hoped the time will come shortly, when landlords aud employers will be compelled by law to maintain the salubrity of their tenants' habitations and the working quarters of their hands. Education should be supplemented by organization, but this is a matter in which American labor is pretty well schooled, though I believe American working women have not yet fully caught the inspiration. Organization, enlightened by education and governed by sound principles, will be able to give effect to all the legitimate demands of labor. As far as I can see, all these demands are legitimate and practicable. Reduced hours, better wages, increased pay for overtime, the special protection of minors and women, and of that terribly abused class, the sailors, the unlimited liability of employers in cases of fatality, the extension of technical and manual training — these constitute a platform in which nothing is abstruse, unjust, or visionary. When the means for accomplishing these results are canvassed there is, however, no unanimity. Strikes and lock-outs are poor expedients at best, and if accompanied by intimidation, are illegal and immoral. Mutiny is death. A man has the right to work for whom he will if he has the right to live. The one is the corollary of the other; and when he is deprived of that right through terrorism or black-listing he is the victim of confederate baabarism as well as criminality. Arbitration is beginning to play a leading part in labor disputes, and it may be that the long-sought solution and synthesis is to be found in it. In any event the laboring community, when properly organized and instructed, can exact their rights either directly by their own action within themselves, or indirectly through the medium of the state. Democracy, the ruler of us all, is ready to carry out their behests, as soon as convinced that they are reasonable and judicious. Any behests, for instance, calculated to drive away or destroy capital — the wage fund — or to intimidate the non-unionist, or black-list the unionist, would not be reasonable or judicious, but offensive to gods and men alike, and rebellious to democratic rule.

That the temperance movement, which has claims on every member of society, has peculiar claims on the sympathy and support of Catholics is all but self-evident. The great apostle of temperance was a Catholic priest and his mission lay among a Catholic people. On the other side there are very many Catholics engaged in the dangerous liquor traffic. It is not my province to dwell on

the subject, but I take the liberty of applauding the wise and comprehensive utterance of the late plenary council held in this city, on it. I will add that whether higher license be the secular solution of the question or not, there are localities in all cities in which no saloon should be permitted—localities in which any form of local option is but a farce or a fraud. There are men, too, of such evil notoriety that no license should be granted to them under any circumstances. The saloons are altogether too many and too flagrant. The temperance question is also a religious question—a fact which the advocates of extirpation too often forget. Any vital reform of the individual must spring from the conscience. No code, however wisely framed or vigorously administered, will suffice of itself to abolish inebriety, while the attempt to do so might cause serious detriment to public morality, by superinducing illicit traffic and giving sanction to hypocrisy.

The question is now, I suppose, on every tongue: Where is all the money to come from for those enlarged public charities, those new educational institutions and appliances, those free lyceums, libraries, swimming baths, gymnasia, parks, public gardens, and establishments for giving temporary refuge and relief to the able-bodied destitute and for utilizing their temporary labor to that end? Nothing is to be more deprecated than the abuse of outdoor relief, and I acknowledge it is perpetually liable to abuse. The creation of phalansteries of official lazzaroni living on forced contributions from the industry and property outside were a consummation to be dreaded and abhorred, but such a paradise of pauperism has not the consistency of a madman's dream, and is an impossibility even in the Utopias of socialism. The question of the ways and means is susceptible of a simple solution. The money should come from the superabundant riches of the plutocrats—from the thirty thousand who own half the wealth of the country and in the production of which the physical disabilities of the poor and their consequent helplessness were in the main contracted. An income tax would solve the problem—an impost from which salaries, commissions, and professional incomes should be exempt and also all incomes from whatever source below a certain round sum.* The fund thus obtained would be practically a fund for the compensation of damages inflicted on individuals and society by the industrial system, and indirectly by the law. To levy a small percentage, say on all incomes of $10,000 a year and upwards, would be no hardship to Midas rioting in superfluity, and no injustice to the class of capitalists and rich men. That small percentage would furnish the state with ample means to carry out the policy outlined here. Perhaps all monopolies and public corporations, enriched by gifts from the federal government, the state or the city, which pay no royalties, should also be taxed the same as a "natural person," care being taken, however, not to tax the same property or person twice. Taxation should be equitably distributed, and therefore no *single tax* can be an equitable one. Every kind of property should bear its proper quota of the public burden, and no one or two kinds the whole burden. But I am not formulating a legislative measure, I

am merely advocating a policy founded (I think) on justice. If the monopolist, the cattle king, and the lord of the "unearned increment" on the surface on in the bowels of the earth, would be wise in time, they must not resist the forthcoming demand for an income tax, which demand I predict will be loud and at last irresistible. True, they have "charters" and "vested interests," and these must be religiously respected as long as the maintenance of them endangers not the foundations of the fabric. Their hoards should be left intact. Spoliation of any kind, in any form, however tempting at the moment, is fatal to the general welfare in the end. But it should not be forgotten how the slaveholders were laid low. In this country more than any other—

Not heaven itself upon the past has power,

but the state can make laws to take effect from and after their passage. We may not make *ex post facto* laws, but I refuse to believe that the people of the United States have bound themselves perpetually in withes which they cannot untie by the patient constitutional processes familiar to the genesis of our form of government — that they cannot free themselves from self-imposed restraints—which in course of time have become chains of iron and bonds of slavery—without having recourse to force, that is to revolution. I prefer to think that for every wrong there is a peaceful remedy, and that the by no means hopeless task of the statesman is to search for that remedy, and apply it as soon as the public are ripe for it. Things nowadays ripen fast, and ideas which are unjustly stigmatized as socialistic by the "vested interests" (these have ever stood as lions in the path of progress) are ripening fast into party policies and social reforms. He who is not wilfully blind can see that the future, uncertain and dark in other respects, belongs to organized labor, unless in the intoxication of new power, it lose its head and degenerate into socialism, communism, or other anarchical and deadly devolution.

---

*If we ask how the great modern fortunes have been acquired in this country, the answer is not far to seek. The federal government, in the first place, has been giving rich mining lands away for nothing, or next to nothing, reserving no power to compel the payment of royalties. It has also given many, many millions of acres as gifts to railroad corporations, especially to the Pacific Railroad Corporations, to whom it has also given public money to the extent probably of $150,000,000. If you ask who are the millionaires of the Pacific coast you are told they are miners and railroad men. The Pennsylvania and New England millionaires are the creation of our tariff laws. The tariff laws account also for a good many of the merchant millionaires of New York. Railroad and other transportation monopolies, the "unearned increment" of real estate, city franchises and bank privileges, usury, account for most of the rest.

Wherever you go, you find the millionaires whom you hear of have gas stocks, railroad stocks, street railroad stocks, patent rights, immense tracts of government lands, mines, all of which have come through the government, federal, state, or local, and which were originally vested in the people. It is not suggested that the fortunate possessors should make restitution to the public of their gains, ill-gotten or otherwise, but that they should contribute more liberally than they do to the support of the victims of their rapacity.

EDUCATION.

THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF THE STATE, THE CHURCH, AND THE PARENT IN THAT REGARD.

FIFTH REGULAR PAPER, BY EDMUND F. DUNNE, LL. D., OF FLORIDA.

Mr. Chairman: Having been invited by your committee to prepare a paper on "Education," I suggested that the subject was rather large, and would they not give a more definite idea of what they wanted? In reply they said: "We should like to have a distinct declaration of the rights and duties of the state, the church, and the parent in that regard." This was still a very comprehensive request. The only way I see to attempt to comply with it is to do so somewhat literally, by making my paper more a *declaration* as to these things, than an *exposition*. I may be able to declare in a general way, in a thirty-minute paper, my idea of what those rights and duties are, and make some little attempt to set forth some of the reasons for that declaration, but anything like a complete setting forth of those reasons must, of course, be looked for elsewhere.

Well then! The rights of the state! How does a state come to have rights? What is a state? There are two theories about that; one, the Catholic, that it is of divine origin; the other the secular, that it is of human invention.

Under the theory of divine origin, it is considered that when God created man, he contemplated him in three relations; toward his Creator, toward his family, toward his fellow-men. Upon him in the first, He imposed duties; to him in the second, He gave control; for him in the third, He established rights. Man can have no rights as against his Creator. Toward Him, only duties. The sum of those duties is to save his soul. This involves religious duties. These he is invited to perform from love and gratitude, for having been created for eternal happiness, but which he is required to perform under pain of eternal punishment.

Having imposed such duties with such a terrible penalty, God, being just, necessarily gave to man, as against his fellow-men, an inherent right to all things necessary to enable him to perform those duties, and therefore the right that his fellow-men should not unlawfully destroy him; whence, man's inherent right to life; in the same way to liberty, to sustenance, to social order, and to the use of so much of God's authority over men and things in this world as might be necessary to insure that order, and to apply that authority through such forms and modes of administration as might from time to time be found necessary or convenient. There was thus the *right* of government, and the *form* of government. The right came from God; the form *might* come from man.

At first there was but one family, developed later into the patriarchal family; filling a whole region of country; governed by the patriarch as visible ruler; whence the so-called patriarchal state. But the real ruler in that state was not the patriarch, but our Lord himself, governing in a direct, personal manner, issuing his commands to the patriarchs, prophets, or judges, to be by them commu-

nicated to the people. Those people lived under God's rule in that manner for 2,900 years, or, if we prefer, until 1,100 years before the coming of our Saviour.

Now, when we talk of proud men, from the beginning, rejecting God's rule and setting up governments of their own, we must remember that those words, rejecting God's rule, are to be taken literally. The Hebrews themselves, under the last of the Judges, also rejected God's rule; not wholly and absolutely, like the others, but they rejected it as to this direct manner of government, and asked for a king that they might be like the others, as to form and manner of government. "And our Lord said to Samuel: Hearken to their voice and make them a king." "For they have not rejected thee, but me."—I Kings VIII, 7, 22. And Samuel made them a king, and thus came the Jewish state, established by divine authority and continuing as a monarchy some 500 years, and as a province under different nations some 600 years.

And then came our Saviour with the new dispensation. We all recognize his religious action with regard to the Jewish *church;* how he amended the moral code; set aside the old ceremonial and with it the former priesthood and the whole organization of the Jewish church. But what political action with regard to the Jewish state, that same state which he had himself established 1,100 years before? He reorganized the domestic relation, foundation of all state organization; abolished divorce; constituted the Christian family, preparatory to the coming Christian state, and the Jewish *church*, animating spirit and constituent element of the Jewish state, having been abolished, he naturally abolished also the Jewish *state*, and this he did by the very simple process of withdrawing its charter, by taking away its title to sovereignty, and commanding the people to give their allegiance to the new power, the Roman state.

Now, this Roman state was pagan, rejecting God's authority; claiming civil supremacy. In recognizing legitimacy of government in the Roman people, our Saviour recognized that from them might properly come a *form* of government, but as the *right* of government was from a higher source, he rejected their claim of civil supremacy and commanded the people to distinguish in their tributes.

That the people might know what things belonged to God, our Saviour, before his crucifixion, began the work of establishing a church, which should be man's guide in this as in all other necessary things. He announced that he would build that church on Peter and that to him should be given the keys, thus showing *primacy* in Peter. (St. Matthew XVI, 18, 19.) Also, that to Peter was already given the perpetual confirmation of faith, thus showing a separate grant of infallibility in teaching, to Peter alone, before the subsequent grant to all. (St. Luke XXII, 31–32.)

After the resurrection, being with the apostles, he completed the building of his church, on Peter, as promised, by associating the other apostles to Peter and then giving them the commission to teach all nations, and, that all might trust them, promised to be with them, all days, even to the consummation of the world. (St. Matthew

xxviii. 18–20.) Now those apostles to whom he spoke were not going to live to the end of the world! Therefore he spoke to them *and their successors in office*, thus constituting them a continuing corporate body with an infallible authority to guide in the spiritual life. That corporate body is the Catholic Church. The bishops are the successors of the apostles, and the Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter, the ever continuing, visible head of the teaching and governing church.

And how does this church govern? By addressing its decrees to the consciences of men. And what is conscience? There are two theories about that, too. One, the Catholic that it is of divine origin; the other, the secular, that it is of human invention.

Under the Catholic theory it is considered that when God created man, having constituted certain senses for the body by which the soul might know the material world, he constituted also a sense for the soul, by which man might know the spiritual world. By that sense the soul knows, intuitively, the elements of the divine law and distinguishes right from wrong: and that sense is conscience, which, properly understood, is man's sovereign guide, determining what tribute belongs to God and what in the spiritual order may be rendered to the state.

And what is the *state*, the political state, and what relation does that bear to all these things? God granted to man the use of power for the preservation of order in society. The political state in any country is that body there which holds that power. If that body consist of one person, then that person is the state. If of king, lords, and commons, then it takes all three of them to make the state. If of people alone, then those people are the state. But not yet anywhere have the whole people held that power. Not women, nor children, nor idiots, nor the insane, nor the unenfranchised, but only those who vote, and, in a republic, those voters, taken in their associate capacity, constitute the state. (They are the political people of that state.) Their rights in that respect are political rights; their power, political power. Whenever a state is so organized, it is a continuing corporation, drawing its charter from divine authority. The officers of that corporation, governor, judge, legislator, they are not the corporation, they are only officers. The governor and legislators of a state corporation correspond to the president and directors of a railroad corporation, and the voters to the stockholders. Society includes all the people, men, women, and children.

The primary function of the state is to preserve order in society The state is made for society, not society for the state. God gave the use of political power to man as a holy trust for a sacred purpose; not for temporary good, except incidentally; but primarily, continuously, and ultimately for one main object—to aid in the attainment of the final end of man; therefore, a state can have no right to *anything* which in *any way* conflicts with that.

Conscience, divinely implanted, enlightened by the church, divinely appointed, informs man what things belong to Cæsar and what things belong to God. And thus the Catholic theory of the divine origin of the Christian state; theory easily workable, wher-

ever there is an honest desire to admit the claims of God, and to respect the rights of man. It is that desire which is often lacking, and therefore the need of the ever continuing providence of God, the perpetual flow of divine grace, sole means of Christian life, and without Christian life, no Christian state. And then the genesis of the Christian state. First, government by our Lord himself, until 1,100 years before Christ, then government, more or less independent, until the coming of Christ, then the elements of the Christian state, lying for a while unorganized and passive under pagan rule; then accession to power in the fourth century, and organization of those elements into the Christian state, continuing until the eleventh century, then the commencement of the falling away of nations, continuing until the present day, when the number of generally Christian states is few indeed.

We have examined the Christian state. Let us now consider the secular state from the Christian point of view. In this view, it is considered that when God created man he gave him will, memory, and understanding. Understanding that he might comprehend the law; memory, that he might remember it; will that he might—*obey* it. The institution of God's law established order in the world, and all was good. Man was placed in the world on probation. Evil could come only from his disobedience. He had power, aided by grace, to use his will to resist temptation, and, through the atonement, gain eternal life. He had also the power to permit his will to yield to temptation, though it was not lawful for him to do so. His first duty was to respect God's authority.

But, from the beginning, proud men rejected God's authority; went out by themselves, and set up governments of their own, ignoring God, and so went on with ancient, oriental, and occidental corruption, in Sidon, Tyre, Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and pagan Rome down to the fourth century, when there was a general conversion to Catholicity, and a consequent recognition of divine authority, continuing unquestioned, in theory, until the eleventh century, when the eastern empire, with its capital at Constantinople, rejected God's authority, and, to a great extent, fell back to materialism, which, in that oriental clime, under Greek cultivation, developed rapidly until the fifteenth century, when there came another great event—the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, the destruction of the eastern empire, and the driving out of the Greek philosophers congregated there. These philosophers swarmed into Europe, bringing with them their philosophy of materialism, essence of the renaissance, beginning of the later revolt. They gathered principally at the court of the Medici, in Florence, and they found there a congenial spirit, that fine Florentine, Nicolo Machiavelli, and in 1532, in his book, "The Prince," came the first modern promulgation of the doctrine of civil supremacy; but, shrewder than most of his followers, he did not undertake to formulate any new theory as to the origin of society. This malarial poison in the body politic appeared next in Switzerland, in Erastus, about 1560, and in Holland, in De Groot, 1621, with the beginning of a theory. It got over into England in 1651, and appeared in all possible malignancy

in Hobbes, with a full-blown social compact theory accompaniment. Locke had it in 1690. It then lay dormant for seventy years, until it broke out with great fury in Rousseau in 1759, and the world has been suffering from it ever since.

Thus we see that the secular state was originally pagan, baptized in the fourth century, and received into the Christian family; in the eleventh century began relapsing, and is now again essentially pagan, with the increased malignancy of a double apostasy. It is error to say that the secular state comes from the devil. These two existences in their original essence both came from God. The similarity between them now comes from their common rejection of divine authority. But the secular state is not yet, in all cases, judged. Where it exists, it still has power over man. In such cases obedience must be rendered, always, of course, with distinction in tribute.

Let us now consider the secular state from its own point of view. In this view it is considered that God did not create man; neither does he concern himself with human affairs. Man is for this world only. He was originally savage, if not something less; gradually evolved to his present condition. Conscience is all a matter of education. Pleasure is the only good. Morality consists in obeying the civil authority. Each citizen surrenders some of his individual liberty, and thus the central power, the state, is formed by social compact. The state is supreme; that is human liberty. The majority must rule; that is individual liberty.

Objections to This Theory.—*First:* On its own theory the secular state has no right to rule, because it denies God, and there is no authority except from God. But the whole theory is false. All history shows that no state was ever originally established by social compact, and philosophy convinces that authority to govern created beings, with power over them of life, and death, can come only from the Creator of those beings. *Second:* It has no guaranty for liberty. The sceptre has long been the symbol of sovereignty; a little wand of a cubit's length, held in the hand, gilded, whence the "golden rod" of authority. When this rod smites unlawful disobedience, that is government. When it smites unjustly, that is tyranny. When kings became tyrannical, lords came forward. When king and lords became tyrannical, the commons developed. When king, lords, and commons became tyrannical, then rose the mighty people. The people wield this sceptre through the hand of the majority. When the majority becomes tyrannical, what then? Self-regeneration? Show one example! *Third:* The secular theory, ignoring God, has no standard of right and wrong, and therefore can have no sense of justice. Illustration: Its denial of parental rights in education; denial costing Catholics here $10,000,000 a year, now, with only one-fourth of their children educated; $40,000,000 for all; in ten years, $400,000,000; in twenty-five years, $1,000,000,000. A serious matter. I do not say that our state is secular; God forbid. But our legislators are already beginning to do some things in the secular manner, in the matter of

education. I think that in this they have not represented the will of the state, and that their action will be revised.

How far must the action of our legislators in the matter of education be revised? How far may the state go in the matter of education? The state may go, in all things, toward the preservation of order, until it is stopped by natural law, by natural rights, the absolute rights of man. The inherent rights of life and liberty are absolute only after a certain limit of diminution is reached. They are subject to so much diminution as may be necessary for social order. The inherent right of parental control in education is absolute, because diminution of it can never be necessary for order. The seeming exception in case of mental or moral incompetency to control is not a real exception, because there is not there a real control.

In the very nature of the case a parent is responsible to God for the soul of his child. Because of this, God, for the protection of the parent, makes his right to the control of the education of that child absolute, so that none may touch it, and for the protection of the child. He makes that right *inaltenable*, so that the parent may have no power to transfer it, so that the child may have the security of the parent's soul that his education will be safely guarded; therefore, the state may never compel the parent to send his child to any school of which the parent disapproves, nor can the parent in conscience surrender his child to the state.

And why should the state ask for the child? What can it do with it? It cannot educate it! It has no power in that direction. The power of the state was given for order alone. It deals only with the body. It may not touch the soul. But may it not instruct the mere mind of the body in secular things? There is no mere mind of the body in *man*. In man there is only body and soul, and you cannot teach children, even the multiplication table, by a Godless teacher, in a Godless school, with Godless surroundings, without hurting the soul. The soul may be slain by famine as well as by violence. Education does not mean to *lead out*, but to *lead up;* to nourish, to feed, to perfect. The state cannot feed the soul; but if the soul be not fed, there is no education. And the soul, like the body, must have its *daily* food, but unlike the body, it absorbs its forming influences at every wakeful moment, and, in the forming age, those influences should *all* be "airs from heaven."

Insolent secularists say two hours a week will suffice, and they have tried it, and we know the result, and we'll none of it! We ask full education for all, but, failing that, as to our own little ones, "an oath" we have, "an oath in heaven," that, henceforth, *their* souls at least shall *have* their daily food.

And let not secularists lay the flattering unction to their souls that Catholics do not want this of themselves; that they ask for it only because the Pope bids them do so. Ah! my secular friends, you know but little of Catholic faith, of Catholic life, of Catholic aspirations! Every time you open your mouths as to these things you show your ignorance; ignorance gross, palpable, profound. Catholics have consciences! They *know* they have souls. They *know* they must fit their children for an immortal life, and because

of that they demand equal rights in the application of the means which God has furnished for that purpose. In this they ask but for justice, the great natural right of every human soul, that no bar be placed in the path to its heavenly home. And shall they not have justice? The state which demands education, which collects money by public tax and pays that money out for teaching, must pay equally all who teach. How dare it discriminate? How dare it keep public money for special favorites? If a share of a public fund for distribution of food for the body were denied to some because of their religion, it would be denounced by all as monstrous. Denial of food for the soul is worse. It is diabolical. But the state cannot pay teachers who teach religion! Why not? Has it then such a hatred for religion? How dare it discriminate against religion? How dare the state try to destroy religion, the only hope of liberty?

But a denominational system would not work well! Why not? It works well elsewhere, why not here. And the present Godless system! Does that work well? A system which in a Christian land forbids Christian teaching! Is not that a disgrace? A scandal to the world? A mockery of free institutions? A failure of republican government? The monarchies of Europe show more regard for human rights. Imperial England gives a freedom in education which republican America denies! Even Protestant Ontario laughs at us to see that we are so far behind the age in this, the greatest question of the day. And yet our sapient legislators think they cannot be instructed in this matter! They mistake their duty! They mistake also the temper of the American people. The great heart of America still yearns for liberty, the largest liberty and the fullest justice, and the public men who will not give it must make way for those who will. The America of to-day and of the future is not simply one of the old colonies, cold-hearted, narrow-minded, persecuting, enlarged in area, unchanged in spirit. No. It is the later gathering here of new lovers of liberty, congregated millions of new races of men, with hearts all aglow with the sacred flame of freedom, minds broadened by contemplation of the illimitable grandeur of the country under their control, souls filled with the noble resolve to make America in very deed and truth the home of liberty, the abode of justice, the domain of law, the world's great sanctuary of inalienable human rights. That's the America that is coming in this country, and the little bigots of to-day will be protected in their liberties then only by invoking the very principles of justice they now seek to destroy.

Our legislators have missed the true dividing line between state and human rights. All rights of the state in the last analysis come to this, the right to preserve order. Laws for life and liberty are for order. Laws for property and development are for order in acquisition and method in development. Morality is the only foundation of order. Therefore the state not only may but must assist in the production of morality. It must do it or die, for without morality order is impossible, and without order the state cannot live. There can be no morality without religion. Therefore the state which wars upon religion undermines its own foundation—pre-

cipitates its own destruction. Moral culture is of more importance to the state than any other. Instruction which does not give it is not education. Therefore the state should encourage education full and complete. To aid in education the state may endow schools and assist teachers, but, itself to teach? No! That is beyond its charter, beyond its rights, beyond its power. The right of the state to expend public money for public welfare is quite reconcilable with this theory of government for order only, and it is only on this theory that those expenditures can be kept within a limit which will be just to the toiling millions who produce the money that legislators like to spend. If the state would expend half as much for morality as it does for vanity everything would be in better condition.

The state recognizes natural law, but governs through civil law. And how does this matter of education stand under civil law? Long before our independence, states were established here, with constitutions fixed by royal charter. Those states were not completely sovereign, but recognition of independence recognized complete sovereignty. Some changes were then made in the constitutions of those states as to the manner of exercising their sovereignty; a confederation of all was entered into, succeeded by abandonment of confederation and the establishment of a common national government with voluntary surrender by the states not of some of their sovereignty, but of their sovereignty as to some things, with retention of it as to all other things.

Under this double sovereignty we have to face two states in this matter, the local state and the national state. Our national state from early days guaranteed religious liberty to all its citizens, but only as against its own legislation. (Permoli's case, 3d Howard.) Any local state might deny religious liberty. Some of them did so. A few years ago the local states made a further surrender of sovereignty, in the fourteenth amendment providing that, "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." Are not the local states barred now as to any religious legislation as much as congress was before? Can present local inhibitions of religious instruction be now enforced?

Secularists ask national amendments permitting prohibition of parochial schools. Such amendments would be revolution. Amendments may be legitimately engrafted on a constitution only when congruous with its spirit. A rejection of principles is not growth, but change, and change is revolution, whether peaceably or forcibly effected. An amendment making the presidency hereditary in the family of the present incumbent would be change, not growth; revolution, not development. Catholics are forbidden, in conscience, to change governments lawfully established, except where by failure in duty they forfeit title.

MR. CHAIRMAN, There is another right of the state, forced into this discussion by misrepresentation of our opponents, the right of allegiance. Our secular friends charge that we hold our allegiance subject to the Pope; that we teach that doctrine in our schools, and that the Pope is infallible; that those schools are thus a menace to

the state; wherefore, the state has a right to suppress them. The American people are too well accustomed to misrepresentations in political contests to believe any grave charge merely because it is made; still, they like to hear the answer:

In this charge secularists confuse many things. They confuse supervision of souls with supervision of nations; infallibility asserted with infallibility denied, and the ages of faith with the days of unbelief, and from all this confusion, darkness of understanding; but, as to Catholic matters, that is the normal condition of the secular mind. Let us try to enlighten it a little on this point. Supervision of souls is teaching, in which we assert infallibility. Supervision of nations is governing, in which we deny infallibility. Supervision of nations was exercised only in the ages of faith, when not one alone, but all Christian nations, were Catholic, all willingly submitting to the jurisdiction of the Holy See. That supervision ceased when that condition ceased, and cannot be renewed until that condition returns. It was only in the exercise of supervision of nations that the question of allegiance arose; hence it cannot arise here.

There is another reason why it cannot arise here. That question arose only where the people were not the state; where the king was the state and became a tyrant, and his subjects, groaning under oppression, wanted to depose him, but, as Catholics, felt bound to submission by their oath of allegiance. Allegiance is a term of feudal law. It represented not a principle, but an individual obligation raised by special contract to give military aid to a superior in return for protection; obligation solemnized by an oath. The contract broken by the superior, the liegeman was released. When the people believed the king had broken his contract, they did not take it upon themselves to judge, but appealed to the Pope. The Pope opened the great tribunal of nations; both sides were heard, as in any other court, and, when the Holy Father decided in favor of the people, he simply *set them free.* The rest they did themselves.

Here we are always free. We are ourselves the state, and if there shall be tyrants here to depose, it will have been our own fault, and so long as we hold all power in our own hands, all the popes that ever lived and ruled in Rome, by all the power of supervision of nations they ever wielded, could not, would not, and — ought not help us. God himself does not save those who will not help themselves. But our secular friends do not give up so easily. They have another cry. They say, "Grant all that, the Pope still controls the consciences of Catholics, and that amounts to the same thing." These men seem not to know whatc onscience is. Conscience is a faculty of the soul. It may be enlightened; it cannot be controlled. God himself does not control it. Conscience does not make a man do right no more than it makes him do wrong. Conscience is the eye of the soul, by which it reads the moral law, and tells man what is right, and what is wrong. Then the man must exercise his will upon the matter, and do wrong at his peril.

Then our secular friends get desperate, and shout: "Well, then, he controls the will. He controls everything. Catholics are slaves to the Pope. They do whatever he tells them" Is it possi-

ble? Italy has 29,000,000 people, 25,000,000 of them Catholic; France, 38,000,000, 35,000,000 of them Catholic — both governments violently persecuting the Pope. Why, then, does not the Pope tell his Catholics to destroy those governments? What a profound contempt for American intelligence secular leaders must have!

But, some may say, There is a point you do not touch. You say Catholics admit the Pope to be infallible in teaching; therefore you will always do what he says is right, no matter what your conscience says. To this objection I have three answers: 1. I deny the conclusion. 2. One who is in good faith in this objection will go to our authorities, and study the subject, and then he will withdraw the objection. 3. To one not in good faith I say, Safer as a citizen is a Catholic with a God, a conscience, and a director even in Rome, than a secularist who ignores God, admits no conscience save such as he makes himself for his own use, and acknowledges no authority but his own desires. Such a man is a moral monster, dangerous to the state, to society, even to his friends.

Secular leaders further show their contempt for American intelligence in this. At the same time that they try to frighten non-Catholics here with the bugbear of the Pope, they try to frighten us with the threat that if we do not keep quiet about this they will give us the persecution of infidel France! Oh! my secular friends! That cry does not frighten any one here. We know that in some things you are wise enough; that you know very well that America is not France; that the French peasant is not the American citizen, born in the air of freedom, nurtured in the atmosphere of independence, filled with the American idea to yield up to tyrants no single human right, though the heavens fall.

This power of supervision of nations was never exercised in minor matters; only in the great crises of nations; never dreaded, save by tyrants; employed only in behalf of liberty and justice. Secular history does not read that way. Oh, no! Secular history for the last 300 years has been a conspiracy to suppress Catholic truth, and because of that non-Catholic Americans to-day are, in religious matters touching the Catholic Church, the most intellectually deceived and enslaved of any people that ever lived on earth. After 300 years of secular history, after more than 40,000 pages of that sort of stuff, written on the very subject in question, even the Athens of America had not yet found out what an "indulgence" was. And now, that point passed, they want to take the same stand in this matter of allegiance. How to be patient with such people. Is it ignorance, or is it malice? I will not answer malice in this matter. It were beneath our dignity to do so; but there are a great many good, easy-going non-Catholics around us who, if innocent of malice, are also innocent of information with regard to us, and who really know less about Catholics here than they think they do about the transportation system of the planet Mars. They do read all that is written about that, but they never read Catholic accounts about us. They never see our papers and our books. They don't know we have any books, except maybe a few prayer books. They know we have no Bibles. Secular history teaches

that. And so, with silence toward malice, I will, for the benefit of these good, innocent people, say a few words to show them why Catholics are likely to have at least as much regard for this country as any other people here.

Why then should we not love this land? Is it not our own? Is it not Columbia? Daughter of Catholic thought; of Catholic wealth; of Catholic courage. And this magnificent city, beautiful Baltimore. Has it not also a Catholic name, that of its great Catholic lord proprietor? And this state we are in. Is it not Maryland? Our old Catholic colony. *Terra Mariæ.* First home here of Christian liberty.

Is not this whole country really a Catholic land? Is it not under the care of Catholic saints? Are not their holy names borne by more than three hundred American cities, from shore to shore, from mountain to the sea? St. Augustine guards the Atlantic coast! St. Francis sits by the Golden Gate! Far in the north the great St. Paul keeps watch and ward! On the gulf, at either side, sweet San Antonio safely guides! In the heart of the land St. Louis, king and saint! St. Joseph near, and on the hither side, our gracious lady, Nôtre Dame, queen of all!

With a Catholic people, this land were surely Catholic. Well, we have 12,000,000 Catholic people! 12,000,000! Four times the whole population of this whole country, when British tyranny was hurled from the land! 12,000,000 Catholics *now*—and of them, the end is not yet! Have we not everywhere Catholic churches, Catholic schools, Catholic convents, Catholic colleges, and now our grand Catholic university, with that noble band of Catholic men, who have followed in the wake of the Ark and Dove to hold aloft here the great beacon lights of Catholic truth! I know our people will give them welcome, such a welcome as men in a strange land never received before. And of educators, remember the greatest of all, one without whose aid vain were all our efforts in this fight, our gallant Catholic press.

And we do not forget to whom, under God, mainly we owe all this, the priests and bishops of our church; to their apostolic efforts; their heroic courage; their patient care; their noble lives lived only for us—and for God. We gladly yield them homage; homage which gives them pleasure only as it gives them hope; hope, that what they won here by toil and care in days gone by, we, by faith and work will safely keep through all the years to come. And there is no fear of that! The Catholic seal is set on this land—forever.

And yet the Holy Father would destroy all this! Would break down the government which guarantees all this! The Holy Father! He who lashes the so-called Catholic governments of Europe, telling them that nowhere does he enjoy his rights so much as under the constitution of the United States! And *he* would withdraw our allegiance from this country! And these be thy guides, O America! But in vain will they impugn the great fact of Catholic allegiance. Loyalty to authority is the brightest jewel in the Catholic crown; one that Catholics will never surrender.

We bring to our country the allegiance common to all, but,

beyond that, we bring also the grand tribute that only Catholic hearts know how to give; the loyalty of Catholic souls; a loyalty which does not grovel on the selfish plane of mere secular submission, but soars above it in the lofty realm of heavenly sanction! Our church is mother of the noblest loyalty. She sanctifies authority, and so makes allegiance holy! We rally round the flag of our country not alone from love and civil duty, but also because of a divinely implanted conscience; motive beyond the comprehension of these secular disciples of cosmic evolution; men whose hearts' desire it is to destroy the Catholic Church. Misguided men! They think to serve the cause of liberty; but when the great social struggle comes in this country—and it is coming—"Slowly comes a hungry people, like a lion, creeping nigher"—when that struggle comes, woe betide the spirit of liberty if the Catholic Church be not there to save; to curb the raging hearts of frenzied men; to preach to them, with Pentecostal fire and with the majesty of divine authority, that vengeance belongs alone to God.

We know that the church will be there. She saw the beginning of all and will see the end of all, and through all will be as she has always been, the friend of order, mother of morals, saviour of men. And our schools, they will also be there! They shall not be destroyed! (Tremendous applause, the delegates rising and cheering vociferously for several minutes, during which the speaker retired.)

Upon the conclusion of Judge Dunne's remarks the congress took a recess for thirty minutes.

AFTER RECESS.

At the expiration of the recess the Convention resumed its session.

The chair appointed the Committee on Future Congresses as follows: James H. Dormer, Buffalo; M. W. O'Brien, Detroit; H. J. Spaunhorst, St. Louis; Patrick Farrelly, New York; M. D. Fansler, Fort Wayne; John D. Keily, Jr., Brooklyn; Hon. Morgan J. O'Brien, New York; John Boyle O'Reilly, Boston; Thomas J. Semmes, New Orleans; William J. Onahan, Chicago; Edmund F. Dunne, San Antonio, Fla.; M. J. Harson, Providence, R. I.; William L. Kelly, St. Paul; Daniel Dougherty, New York.

MR. ONAHAN: "I move, Mr. President and gentlemen, that the name of the chairman of this convention be placed at the head of that committee. I will put the motion to the congress."

The question was put and the motion was agreed to unanimously.

MR. DONOHUE, of Maine: "In order to give expression to the great gratitude we feel for the able and instructive address of Judge

Dunne, I move that by a rising vote a vote of thanks be extended to that gentleman."

The vote was taken, and the convention arose *en masse.*

MR. ONAHAN: "I move that the resolution presented here by the gentleman from Indiana which went to the committee on resolutions be referred to the committee on future congresses; it more properly comes within the province of that committee."

THE CHAIRMAN: "It will be so referred if there be no objection."

The committee appointed to wait upon the president of the United States through its chairman, Mr. Joseph J. O'Donoghue, of New York, reported as follows;

MR. JOSEPH J. O'DONOGHUE, of New York: "The distinguished honor was conferred upon me and fourteen other gentlemen of appointment by this body to wait upon the president of the United States, and to extend to him an invitation to be present at this meeting. I am proud to say he received us cordially and handsomely. (Applause.) If it were not for the duties that are now imposed upon him in preparing his message, he sends back word through this committee, he would be only too happy to be present. But he says to-morrow he wants to be with you at the opening of the Catholic university. (Applause.) I felt highly honored as a Catholic to hear him express, and very feelingly, too, that this congress would do a great deal of good, and he approved not only of this, but of all other congresses of the same character. (Applause.) Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say in reporting from your committee. I move the adoption of the report."

The report was adopted unanimously.

THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL PRESS.

SIXTH REGULAR PAPER, BY GEORGE DERING WOLFF, LL.D., OF NORRISTOWN, PA.

Your Eminence, Most Reverend and Right Reverend Archbishops and Bishops, Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers, Mr. President, and Gentlemen: Your committee have honored me with the request to prepare a paper on "The Catholic Periodical Press," to be read before this assembly. I attempt the task willingly, yet with unaffected diffidence, for I realize its delicacy and its difficulty, as well as its importance.

In the thoughts which I propose to present, I shall confine myself almost entirely to Catholic newspapers, or, as they might more properly be styled, Catholic journals. For as, with but very few exceptions, they are published only once a week, their reports

of current events are anticipated by daily newspapers, and cannot, therefore, have the freshness and novelty, usually attached to the word "news."

In thus confining the scope of my intended remarks, two considerations influence me. In the first place, considering the necessarily restricted limits as regards time and space, of this paper, I do not think I have misinterpreted the intention of your committee. Secondly, the number of Catholic periodicals that are published quarterly or monthly, is comparatively small. Moreover, there is reason to believe that they more closely approximate the ideal of a truly Catholic periodical than do Catholic weekly journals, and are, therefore, less open to criticism.

Of the immense power of the press, and more particularly of the newspaper press, in the United States, it is needless to speak. To dilate upon it would only be to repeat acknowledged truisms. The issues of the newspaper press penetrate into every village and hamlet and family in our vast country. Their statements and expressions of opinions are read with avidity, and affect, for good or for evil, almost every one, powerfully influencing his thoughts, feelings and actions. They are made the subject of constant conversation and comment; are quickly communicated to the few who, in this age and country, are unable to read, or to read with facility, and thus they mould the opinions and character even of the illiterate. In short, the press, and particularly the newspaper press, is to-day the mightiest human instrumentality that man can employ. Its power, immense and far-reaching, has been recognized and emphatically referred to by sovereign pontiffs of the church, especially by our late Holy Father, Pius IX, and by his successor, Leo XIII. Speaking of how the power of the press has been perverted to wrong ends and employed by the adversaries of true religion to malign the church, and especially the Holy See, our sovereign pontiff, Leo XIII, said to a deputation of Catholic journalists, whom he received on February 23d, 1879:

"A person would not deviate far from the truth were he to ascribe this deluge of evils and the miserable condition of the times to the wickedness of the press."

But as every instrumentality that man can invent or discover is powerful for evil only when it is misdirected, misused, and perverted, so, too, it is equally or more powerful for good when it is rightly directed and rightly employed. This truth our Holy Father plainly declares in the same address, from which the foregoing quotation is made. He says:

"Wherefore, since custom has made newspapers a necessity, Catholic writers for them should labor principally to apply to the salvation of society and the defence of the church, that which is used by the enemy for the destruction both of the one and the other."

It would be impossible to describe in fewer words and with greater clearness the true mission of the Catholic press, or to show the noble and exalted ends it should strive to subserve—"THE SALVATION OF SOCIETY AND THE DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH." Of the activity and immense power of the agencies that are working

for the destruction of society, and, were it possible, of the church also, no observing and thoughtful mind can doubt. The general trend of opinion, outside of the Catholic Church, in Europe—and it is rapidly becoming so in this country—is in this direction. Hostility to authority, both in church and in state, is constantly increasing. "The majesty of the law" has almost become an obsolete phrase. In the name of liberty false notions are disseminated, which, carried out to their logical conclusions, are destructive alike of civil order and of religion.

In Europe infidels and atheists, miscalled Liberals, differing among themselves as regards their respective notions and theories, yet united by force of common hatred of religion and of all true legitimate authority, whether in the church or the state, under the pretence of concern for human rights and liberty, are seizing and holding the reins of political power, and tyrannize over peoples of which numerically they form but a small part. In the names of liberty and of popular government they are striving to subvert the fundamental principles of social and civil order, and to establish a socialistic, beaurocratic despotism under which the individual would be reduced to an insignificant atom, a mere automaton, destitute of all real volition in the atheistic commune, in which personal rights and true freedom, religious, civil, educational, and industrial, would be impossible. In the name of *free* education it is sought to impose on the public a system of education from which freedom of religious education shall be excluded. In the name of *religious* freedom it is sought to rob religion of its divine elements and sanctions, to either exclude it entirely from public recognition or else to make it a subject that has its foundation in the state or in human opinion as regulated by the state, and thus to deprive the church and its membership of all real, true freedom, by making the church subordinate to the state, in fact, a mere department or bureau of the state.

These ideas, alike false and destructive of religious faith, of the true principles of morality, civil liberty, and social order, are rapidly finding expression on this side of the Atlantic as well as in Europe. They pervade much of our popular literature. Some of our most popular magazines and most widely circulated newspapers are constantly putting them forth under every possible form. It is this pernicious literature that forms the daily pabulum of a large part of the people of the United States. It enters into and affects their intellectual and moral development as certainly and vitally as the food they eat enters into their bodies and affects their physical health and strength.

It is of utmost importance, therefore, to the interests of religion and the welfare of our country that our Catholic literature should present, as our Holy Father Leo XIII has declared it can and should present, the antidote to the pestilential literature to which we have just referred. And in no other form can that antidote be so effectively presented as in that of vigorous, ably conducted newspapers pervaded by a truly Catholic spirit. Whether it be regarded as something to be rejoiced at or to be deprecated, it is nevertheless a fact that the rapidity of movement that characterizes our age in

other respects also characterizes it as regards its intellectual and moral ideas and action. Hence, to properly influence the public mind upon subjects in which it is interested, newspapers, from a convenience, have become a necessity. Very many of our non-Catholic newspapers which honestly intend to be fair and impartial in their discussions of subjects bearing upon the Catholic religion, nevertheless are unconsciously pervaded by an anti-Catholic animus. To counteract their influence in this respect it is all-important that there should be a vigorously, intelligently and ably conducted Catholic newspaper press.

There is one other reason that we will mention. It is a reason which comes directly home to every one who wishes to be a faithful, devout, consistent Catholic and to train his children in like manner. We refer to the obligations of Catholics who value their own souls and the souls of the children God has given them and whose souls he will require at their hands, to guard themselves and to guard their children against the subtle and pernicious influence of reading that will injuriously affect their spiritual welfare.

There are, in fact, few non-Catholic, secular newspapers, which can be read indiscriminately by Catholics without their injuring themselves spiritually and involving themselves in the sin of disobeying the precept to abstain from whatever brings us into companionship with impurity (whether in thought or word or deed), or that tends to weaken faith, devotion, the spirit of filial obedience, or reverence for holy things. Very many Catholics think, or act as if they think, that they are at liberty to read newspapers which notoriously exert an influence such as we have spoken of; and they permit their children to read them. Catholics have no more right to read such papers, or to permit their children to read them, than they have to associate with, or to permit their children to associate with irreverent or bad persons, or with those who sneer and scoff at the true faith.

The easiest and most effective safeguard against this is furnished by good Catholic literature, and by that literature in the form of magazines and newspapers. For, as the best way to prevent the ingress of foul air into a house is to provide a constant influx of pure air, so the easiest and best way to keep bad newspapers out of a family is to furnish it with pure, sound Catholic newspapers.

But here it is necessary to distinguish; and in the distinction we make we are strictly following the instructions of our Holy Father, Leo XIII, and of the third plenary council of Baltimore. There are newspapers which in spirit and in contents are truly Catholic; and there are others, which are professedly Catholic, but in actual fact are most un-Catholic, and some of them decidedly anti-Catholic. Referring to this the fathers of the third plenary council of Baltimore, whose acts and decrees have been approved by the Holy See, have made the following emphatic declaration:

"Whilst we commend Catholic newspapers, we admonish the faithful that not all newspapers which parade the name Catholic are truly Catholic. Their writers boast that they are Catholic, but by

their example and writings they disgrace that holy name and expose it to scorn."

Thus we are confronted with the question: "What is a truly Catholic newspaper?" The answer to this question is plainly given in the decree from which we have just quoted:

"Let that only be held to be a *Catholic* newspaper which sets forth and defends the doctrines of the church, narrates the progress of the church at home and abroad, and is ready to submit in all things to the authority of the church."

Here three characteristic marks or tests of a newspaper that is truly Catholic are plainly stated.

The first is that it "sets forth and defends the doctrines of the church."

It may be well, in view of erroneous notions prevailing in some quarters, to dwell briefly on this.

It is the doctrine of the church, not the notions which writers for Catholic newspapers may "evolve out of their own inner consciousness," or pick up and adopt from any and every source, that they are to set forth and defend. Catholic newspapers are not authoritative teachers and expounders of what their editors, or other writers for them, in the exercise of their own individual judgment may suppose or imagine is, or ought to be, true Christian doctrine. That doctrine it is for them to receive and accept, without hesitation or question, and in a truly docile spirit, as it comes to them through the divinely constituted authorities of the church, which is its divinely appointed perpetual custodian and infallible teacher. It is the honorable work and duty of editors of and writers for Catholic newspapers to declare that doctrine as thus taught to them, and to defend it against those who assail and misrepresent it.

It is impossible to emphasize this distinction too strongly in this age of almost universal license and so-called "free thought." Owing to this distinction not being constantly kept in mind, not a few writers for Catholic newspapers have egregiously erred and done great harm whilst sincerely, perhaps, intending to do good. We repeat it, and with emphasis, Catholic newspapers, or their editors or writers, have no mission, no authority to decide — and it is simply the height of arrogance for them to presume to attempt to decide — upon what *is* Catholic doctrine. *Their* work is to declare that doctrine as they have received it from the church, and to defend it against those who assail it, misrepresent it, and who would pervert and corrupt it if they could.

Nor is this minimizing or in the least degree degrading the office and work of a Catholic newspaper. To take an example from purely human pursuits, a lawyer, however learned and eminent he may be, does not consider himself degraded when he submits to the decisions of the court. To go up still higher, and take an example from the holy apostles, St. Paul expressly says that he taught not his own doctrine, but that which he had received, that which had been taught to him. He emphatically declares that if he or an angel from heaven taught any other doctrine, "Let him be anathema."

The second characteristic of a truly Catholic newspaper is a very

plain one. It is that it keep its readers acquainted with the progress of the church in its own vicinity and in other regions. On the importance of this surely it is not necessary to dilate. We all naturally desire to read of those things which most deeply concern us. A dutiful child is interested in all that concerns its mother. A true patriot reads with intense interest all that pertains to his country's condition, its struggles against adverse circumstances, its success in overcoming them, its prosperity and progress. If this country is engaged in war he notes with profound concern all the movements of its armies and those of its adversaries, its victories and defeats, its successes and reverses. He rejoices over the one and mourns over the other.

In like manner the true children of the church are deeply concerned in all that pertains to the condition and progress of the church, not only at home, but throughout the world. To inform its readers respecting these things is one of the most important parts of the work of a Catholic newspaper.

Obedience to ecclesiastical authority is the third characteristic laid down by the council of Baltimore. On this it is unnecessary here to dwell. The obligation is imperative and its meaning unmistakable. We shall, however, have something further to say on this subject in a subsequent part of our paper.

Elsewhere, but in the same decree from which we have been quoting, the council of Baltimore lays down another requisite of a truly Catholic newspaper. It says:

"It is especially necessary that whatever they (Catholics) themselves write, and whatever they insert in their papers, taken from others, shall accord with the laws of Christian charity and moderation. And even when they are defending our most holy religion against the accusations and calumnies of slanderers they should aim to confound them by the weight of their arguments, and not rail at them with bitter words, reproaches, and maledictions."

The council also declares: That when a controversy arises between Catholics honestly differing in opinion the same rule shall be observed. "For among men of good will," it says, "Christian charity can well exist along with difference of opinion."

These injunctions are supported by an extract from the letter of the sovereign pontiff, Leo XIII, of August 3d, 1881. It is as follows:

"In carrying on controversies care must be taken not to exceed the bounds of moderation which the rules of justice and charity prescribe; nor should persons who are devoted to the doctrines of the church, and especially not those who in the church are eminent in dignity and authority, be rashly accused, or otherwise brought under suspicion."

It is well for those of us who are editors or managers of Catholic newspapers to frequently and seriously ponder these declarations and injunctions. They are solemn and express declarations of the third plenary council of Baltimore following out and applying the instructions of the sovereign pontiff of the church. They serve as guide-posts to keep us in the right road; they are salutary instructions and warnings to keep us from injuring, in our mistaken earn-

estness and zeal, the holy cause we are striving to promote; they are tests by which all may measure and determine how closely each of the journals we are connected with approaches to, and how far it falls short of realizing, the ideal of a true Catholic journal; they serve as tests, too, by which true Catholic newspapers can be known and distinguished from pretended Catholic, but in reality un-Catholic and anti-Catholic newspapers, and the real spirit and character of the latter be discovered, despite their false pretensions.

The question now naturally arises: To what extent do Catholic newspapers in this country, generally, attain or fall short of the ideal of a true Catholic newspaper? As regards the first characteristic — that of setting forth and defending Catholic doctrines — there is reason to believe, as respects what may be called the "theological" doctrines of the church, few or none of our Catholic newspapers (excluding from this remark pretended but really un-Catholic papers) are seriously deficient. Many of them exhibit commendable vigilance and energy in repelling assaults upon the Catholic religion and correcting misrepresentations of it. Of course there is a difference. Some are more active and vigorous than others in this respect, but the difference, we believe, results rather from difference in their respective strength and ability, than from lack of earnestness and zeal.

Perhaps this statement should be qualified. There is room to fear that as regards a class of subjects which are essential parts of Catholic doctrine, some of our Catholic journals are less careful than they should be to acquaint themselves with and follow the teachings of the church and of her approved theologians. We refer to subjects pertaining to the authority of the church, the office and authority of the sovereign pontiff of the church, his rights and power, and especially his right to independence of every temporal sovereign or government; we refer, also, to all those subjects which relate to the origin and constitution of human society; to the basis of civil government, its origin, authority, power, and the limits of its authority and power; to the industrial questions of the day, the relation of labor and capital, or rather, the relation of employers and employes; to the right of individual ownership of property and the limits of that right.

As regards all of these subjects, or most of them, there is reason to think that less attention, than should be, is given by Catholic editors and writers to the teachings of the church and its theologians; and that some of them, indeed, imagine that they are free to adopt and express whatever opinions they please respecting these subjects, regardless of the official utterances of sovereign pontiffs of the church and of its theologians. It is to be feared that these last-mentioned writers unwittingly subject themselves to the following condemnation of the third plenary council of Baltimore. Referring to editors of some so-called (falsely so-called) Catholic newspapers, the fathers of that council declare:

"They scatter their own notions among the unthinking populace, which notions, too often, are nothing else than visionary theo-

ries of infidels and innovators respecting the origin of society and the limits of the civil power."

No more grievous mistake can be made than to imagine that the subjects referred to are not included in the scope of Catholic doctrine and in that *magisterium* or authority to teach with which Christ has invested his church. Religion has to do with all the relations of man, to God, to himself, to his individual neighbor, and to society. The church comprehends in its teaching office all that religion comprehends, and consequently, all that is involved in and grows out of the relations just mentioned. The subjects we have referred to are inseparably connected with those relations; they have their roots in them, and derive their guiding, ruling principles from them. The divinely prescribed laws of justice and charity, too, govern them, and determine the obligations and duties that grow out of them. It is needless to add that to make known, expound, explain, and practically apply all that the laws of justice and charity comprehend, belongs immediately and directly to the authoritative teaching office of the church. Catholics, therefore, err most grievously when they allow themselves to be deluded into supposing that the subjects to which we are referring are mere matters of opinion, and that they are at liberty to think, speak, write, or act with regard to them as they please. In so imagining they expose themselves to the imminent danger of losing their faith and the spirit of true obedience to the authority and teaching of the church, and thus they not only imperil their own souls, but the souls also of all whom they influence.

There is another reason why Catholics, and especially Catholic writers in this country, should studiously acquaint themselves with the teachings of the church on the subjects to which we are referring. These subjects are practical "burning" questions of the day. They cannot be neglected or ignored. They are coming constantly to the front, and imperatively demanding right answers and just practical solutions. If the solution given be the right one, our country will continue to prosper, and its people will continue at peace with themselves; our free institutions will continue; our government, with its safeguards for personal rights and freedom, will continue. But if the practical solution be wrong, there is peril impending and close at hand, plainly visible to every thoughtful, discerning eye, of social disorders, confusion, and convulsion, the thought of which must fill with horror every true lover of our country, its institutions, and its welfare.

Catholics are an integral part of the population of our country. They are daily becoming a more numerous and more influential part. They have a common interest along with other citizens, in the peace, the prosperity, the welfare of our country. They are lovers of our country, deeply attached to its institutions and its government, warm and earnest supporters of them. None are more so. Motives of patriotism, therefore, as well as regard for the interests of true religion, demand that Catholics, and especially Catholic editors and writers, thoroughly acquaint themselves with

the teachings of the church on these subjects, and strictly follow that teaching.

If another reason were wanting, it would be found in this: The church is especially concerned for the poor. "The poor have the Gospel preached to them." The church has been the guardian and defender of the poor in all ages. She is this to-day, and ever will be. Therefore, if Catholic editors and writers are, and are resolved to continue faithful children and members of the church, they must have like special consideration for the poor. It is the poor who sell their labor to those who are more wealthy. It is the poor who are employes of the employers. Unhappily, contentions and strife too often arise between the two classes. Their respective interests, which ought to be harmonious, are almost constantly now made antagonistic. Through these antagonisms, disorders and tumults arise, injuriously affecting the good order and peace of society, and destroying the good will and mutual coöperation which ought to exist between all, irrespective of their occupations, pursuits, social position, and pecuniary circumstances.

It is the imperative duty of Catholic editors and writers to penetrate into and thoroughly understand the causes of this unhappy state of things. It is their office to instruct both employers and employes as to their mutual relations and their respective rights and duties, and the limitations of their rights. If either employers or employes overstep their rights, or are derelict as to their duties, it is the duty of Catholic editors and writers to speak out plainly and courageously, yet prudently, and to rebuke whosoever is in the wrong. This duty is all the more imperative, because whenever the antagonisms to which we are referring, arise, and whatever be their immediate outcome, and whoever be in the wrong, it is the poor who invariably suffer.

Nor are Catholic editors and writers without sufficient guides to enable them safely, prudently, and efficiently to perform this most useful and most important work. Eminent and approved Catholic theologians have lucidly written on these subjects; pre-eminent among them all, St. Thomas Aquinas. If Catholic editors and writers have not access to his works, or his principal works, in the original texts, they can study them through the medium of approved English translators and commentators. The encylicals, too, of our Holy Father, Leo XIII, are an inexhaustible storehouse of instruction on these subjects.

The next characteristic of a true Catholic newspaper, which naturally comes now under consideration, though not in the order in which we stated it, is the regard which Catholic newspapers, in their defence of the doctrines of the church, show for that moderation and charity which our Holy Father and the plenary council of Baltimore declare should characterize a true Catholic newspaper. Too often all of us, with very few exceptions, forget the maxim, *Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.* Too often we return railing by railing, and deal in bitter invectives, when a more courteous manner and a gentler spirit would be much more effective, as well as more consonant with Christian charity.

Then, too, before we leave this point, we cannot but advert to the flagrant violations of the injunctions of our Holy Father, Leo XIII, and of the council of Baltimore, by Catholic newspapers in their controversies with one another. On such occasions, and about matters concerning which there is ample room for difference of opinion, Catholic newspapers too often exhibit a spirit of bitterness that would be utterly indefensible if indulged in towards even the most malevolent defamer of our holy religion. What an occasion for scorn all this furnishes to the enemies of our holy religion, and how disedifying it is to readers of these newspapers, it is needless for us to say.

There is, certainly, great need for Catholic newspapers guarding themselves against the spirit of envy, jealousy, and selfish rivalry, and cultivating that spirit of mutual consideration and mutual coöperation and union which our Holy Father and the third council of Baltimore have solemnly enjoined them to cherish.

The second test by which the true Catholic newspaper is recognized is its publishing news respecting the church and all that pertains to her condition and progress at home and abroad. Our Catholic newspapers differ, as might be expected, with regard to the degree in which they fulfill this requirement, some of them paying far more attention to it than do others. Yet this difference, we are inclined to think, results chiefly from difference in their financial strength and their opportunities to become acquainted with what I may call "Catholic News."

When we consider the vast field of information that is comprised under the term "Catholic News," the movements and occurrences having a bearing upon the Catholic religion in each diocese in our own vast country; in Canada, in Mexico, in Central and South America, in all the countries of Europe, in Australia, in the numerous missionary fields of Asia and Africa; the movements in and around Rome referring to the present position of the Holy Father; his allocutions, addresses, and encyclicals — when we consider all this we can realize how extensive is the field to be gone over and how difficult it is to even approximately gather and publish what it is important should be published, and than which nothing could well be more interesting and edifying to faithful members of the church. To properly do all this would exceed in the expenses that would necessarily have to be incurred the resources of the strongest and most prosperous Catholic newspaper in our country. Nor can it ever be expected that even approximately due attention will ever be paid to this very important part of a Catholic newspaper's work until a support is furnished them five-fold greater than that which they now receive.

With regard to the spirit of subordination and implicit obedience to ecclesiastical authority which must characterize every *true* Catholic newspaper, there is, we believe, a steady and constant improvement. Yet that there is great room for further improvement in this respect on the part of some Catholic newspapers in this country, cannot be denied. There are Catholics, controlling and editing Catholic newspapers, who, we believe, are entirely honest in their

expressed desire to make their newspapers truly Catholic, yet who seem never so happy as when criticising, in the exercise of their own individual judgment, the actions of priests and bishops and the manner in which their ecclesiastical superiors manage matters pertaining to the church, its affairs and interests; who seem never so happy as when they can expose to the public, and carp and quibble and sneer at some mistake or inconsistency (real or supposititious), of those who are placed over them in the church. They seem to be entirely unconscious of and unconcerned about the immense harm that in this way they are doing to religion. Their conduct has been repeatedly rebuked and condemned by sovereign pontiffs of the church; and the fathers of the third plenary council of Baltimore have pronounced the following condemnation upon them:

"We declare that they themselves and those who assist and encourage them in this most pernicious abuse are disturbers of good order, contemners and enemies of the authority of the church, and guilty of the gravest scandal; and, therefore, when their guilt has been sufficiently proved, should be punished with canonical censures."

In this connection it is proper to allude to an opinion that seems to exist in the minds of even some intelligent Catholic editors and writers. Strange to say, they seem to imagine that there is a difference as regards the nature and extent of the obligations of Catholic newspapers to submit to ecclesiastical authority, to closely follow the teachings of the church and to abstain from criticising their ecclesiastical superiors and the manner in which they administer the matters committed to their charge; a difference between Catholic newspapers which are published with, and those which are published without the express official approval of the ordinary of the diocese in which their publication offices are respectively situated. Those which have that approval are commonly styled "bishops' organs," and are sneered at as having no freedom of action or liberty of opinion. They are scornfully referred to (shamefully misrepresented) as under obligations to abstain from the discussion of subjects which Catholic newspapers that have no such express official approval are entirely at liberty to discuss in any way or manner they please.

It is surprising that such an opinion should be entertained and expressed by any intelligent Catholic. There is no possible excuse for it. It must be attributed to either inexcusable ignorance or wilful malevolent misrepresentation.

The fathers of the third council of Baltimore have sufficiently guarded this subject. According to their decree on the subject of Catholic periodicals there cannot be any such thing as an "official organ" of a bishop or an archbishop. They have defined the limits and meaning of the approval which a bishop or an archbishop may give to a Catholic newspaper published in his diocese, and in the general conduct of which he has confidence. They expressly declare that the approval of the ordinary of a diocese simply means that he believes that nothing is or will be published in the newspaper to which he has given his official approval, contrary to faith

or morals, or that is disedifying. They have also expressly declared that bishops and archbishops cannot and may not make themselves responsible for anything published in newspapers except what is published by the bishops or archbishops themselves in the exercise of their official functions and over their own names.

The obligation referred to rests equally upon Catholic editors and writers, irrespective of their having or not having episcopal approval, just as the same obligation rests upon all other members of the church.

We conclude with some thoughts upon the manner in which Catholic newspapers may more fully realize the ideal of a true, perfect Catholic journal, and, in their own proper sphere and scope, become more efficient instrumentalities for disseminating and defending truth and promoting the interests of the church and of society. This branch of our subject might well form a separate paper; the topics it embraces are so numerous and various. But your patience, doubtless, is well nigh exhausted, and we must necessarily be brief.

The first requisite to this is that we brethren of the Catholic newspaper press cherish the spirit of fraternal unity. We should cast away as unworthy of our high and important office, all envy and jealousy, should abstain from needless disedifying bickering and contention with one another, and coöperate together cordially in striving to promote the cause in whose defence we are all enlisted. There is a world of wisdom in the well known saying, "In union there is strength." But on this we need not dwell. Our Holy Father has solemnly enjoined this on us, and the third plenary council of Baltimore earnestly exhorts us to constantly keep in mind his injunctions.

It is necessary, too, that we cultivate the spirit of gentleness and charity in dealing with the adversaries of our holy religion. sovereign pontiffs of the church have exhorted us to this, and have set before us as the great exemplar for us to strive to imitate, and as our patron saint, the holy Francis de Sales, who, by his meekness, sweetness of temper, and unvarying courtesy, changed inveterate enemies into warm friends, turned aside or blunted the sharpest shafts that were hurled against the church, and thus won more victories than other powerful champions of the truth were able to achieve by more violent and seemingly bolder efforts.

Again, it is necessary that more care be taken to exclude all disedifying matter from our columns. It seems needless to say even a word about this. The obligation is imperative. Yet, unfortunately, in a number of professedly Catholic newspapers, and more especially among those which are feebly supported and struggling for an existence, the obligation seems to be almost wholly neglected. Prurient advertisements and pictures which are indelicate and indecent and suggestive of evil, are to be found in their columns. Disedifying reading matter, and sometimes stories of a highly objectionable character, replete with mawkish sentimentality, with modern ideas about free love, legal divorces and marriages permitted by the civil law but condemned by the church, along with religious notions

which are covertly or openly antagonistic to the doctrines of the church, make these newspapers positively pernicious.

Another improvement in Catholic newspapers, we are inclined to think, would be their more commonly republishing editorials and "Church News," or summaries of them, taken from other Catholic newspapers, and duly credited.

Still another and a highly important requisite is their taking measures to secure fresher and fuller reports written by loyal, devout Catholics, of what Catholics in other countries are doing, and also of what the enemies of the church are doing in those countries.

The great need of this will be obvious to every one if he considers that the news agencies of Europe are almost entirely under the management of persons who are not only non-Catholics, but in a large number of instances infidels and bitter enemies of the Catholic Church. We believe that our leading daily newspapers, with a few exceptions, honestly wish to be fair and truthful in the reports which they publish respecting Catholic affairs, but their foreign correspondents being in some cases anti-Catholic, in others non-Catholic, and in only a few instances real, true Catholics, as a matter of course, the reports they send, even of true occurrences, are discolored, one-sided, and often intentionally falsified. Moreover, their news agents and correspondents are always on the *qui vive* for "news," and consequently seize upon every report and rumor, without delaying sufficiently to enable them to ascertain its authenticity or accuracy. They enlarge upon it, comment upon it, give it the shape and coloring which they think will make it most sensational, and then telegraph or mail it at once to this country. Here it is quickly published. Our Catholic newspapers have no such facilities for promptly receiving authentic news. They may be fully convinced of the falsity of the reports that are published in the non-Catholic newspapers, but they cannot promptly contradict them nor satisfactorily explain and expose the discolorations and prevarications of those that are partly true and partly untrue. After a week or two they obtain definite information, and are able to disprove the false report or to give a true version of what has been misrepresented. But the falsehoods and misrepresentations have already done their bad work in misleading public opinion, and the corrections and refutations made by Catholic newspapers if made at all, are too late to attract attention.

To relieve the Catholic press of this enormous disadvantage, two things are necessary. The first is to establish and maintain an active, vigilant, and energetic Catholic associate press agency. The second is to establish in one of our large cities a Catholic daily newspaper, subsequently to be followed by the establishing of others in other large cities. The idea of a Catholic associated press has been mooted before and pronounced impracticable by persons of large practical experience and keen business insight. Yet, for all that, we remain unconvinced of its impracticability, and urge it upon the attention of our brethren of the Catholic press. We do this all the more confidently and earnestly because we are strongly supported by persons whose judgment is entitled to high consideration.

Among them are several experienced Catholic journalists who have spoken favorably of the undertaking.

The establishing of a Catholic daily newspaper is necessary, because Catholic weekly journals (owing to the fact that they are published only once a week) cannot quickly expose and refute the falsehoods and calumnies that are constantly invented and spread abroad respecting the church, and especially respecting the Holy See. In this rapidly moving age of ours what is to be done effectively must be done at once. In our conflict with the enemies of our religion our counter-strokes must follow their blows with lightning-like speed.

The fathers of the third plenary council of Baltimore thoroughly understand this. They declare:

"It is greatly to be desired that in each of our large cities a Catholic daily newspaper be maintained, fully equal to the secular daily newspapers in financial strength, and the sagacity, vigor, and power of its writers. Nor is it necessary that the word Catholic be displayed at the head of its pages. It is sufficient that, in addition to recent occurrences, and all those things which in other daily newspapers are eagerly desired, it defend, whenever a proper opportunity presents itself, the Catholic Church from the assaults and calumnies of its enemies, and explain its doctrine; and, moreover, that it carefully abstain from placing before its readers anything that is scandalous, indecent, or unbecoming."

It is argued that a Catholic daily newspaper cannot be successfully maintained. Why? Is it because of want of sufficient capital, of sufficient journalistic talent, of sufficient administrative ability among the Catholics of the United States? Emphatically, it is *not*. There is to-day more than enough capital invested by Catholics in non-Catholic newspapers all over the land to amply provide for a dozen or a score of Catholic dailies. There are, on the great non-Catholic dailies of our large cities, Catholics who, in sagacity, quickness, fulness of knowledge, and all that goes to make a successful journalist, are peers to any of their non-Catholic fellow-workers. As for administrative, executive, directing ability, we have Catholics managing successfully and with distinguished ability railroads, mills, mines, factories, banks, and insurance companies. Passing strange would it be if Catholic talent could not be found competent to cope with the difficult task of managing a great daily newspaper. What is really wanting is the *will*. As soon as Catholics in the United States *will* to establish such a newspaper, the men and the money to maintain and conduct it will be quickly found. And until such a newspaper (or a number of them) shall have been established, the Catholics of this country will not be doing what they might do and ought to do to defend the church, and to promote the welfare, social, moral, and religious, of the great people, of which Catholics are an integral component part; and consequently they will not be doing what they might do, and ought to do, to preserve and perpetuate our civil institutions, of which it is needless to say that morality and religion, combined with intelligence, are the firmest supports.

And now to prevent any possible misunderstanding we add

that we have passed over as not needing to be suggested, that, as a matter of course, Catholic newspapers designed for general circulation should not confine themselves to subjects of a strictly religious character. They should discuss intelligently the events and occurrences of the day, questions of civil polity, questions that refer to the industrial, commercial, and other interests of our country, but not in a narrow or partisan sense. Along with this they should furnish their readers, according to the condition, circumstances, tastes, and social status of those whose support they respectively aim at securing, what will best amuse and interest them. In short, they should aim to present in their columns all that characterizes a pure, fresh, entertaining, vigorous newspaper.

The importance of this seems to us self-evident, but it is not sufficiently attended to by editors of some of our Catholic newspapers. Their pages lack variety. In some instances they are too heavy. The range of topics covered both by their editorials and their selections, is too narrow. The "scissors and the paste pot" are employed too hurriedly and without sufficient thought or good judgment. In other words, too little care and discrimination are exercised in making selections of matter taken from other newspapers and periodicals. There is too much "padding." Too little attention is given to the process of "boiling down"; the art and power of summarizing and condensing into smaller compass, yet preserving the pith and substance of what is thus summarized, are too seldom employed. There is room for improvement in these respects in many of our Catholic newspapers. We are sure, too, that such improvement will be followed by increased circulation.

But that Catholic newspapers may even approach the realization of what we have been urging, it is necessary that a support far greater than that which any of them now receive be accorded them. Until this is done—and it is not done now—much that we have written will be entirely impracticable, purely visionary. Editors of Catholic newspapers and their assistants are notoriously overworked and underpaid. There are, among editors and writers for Catholic newspapers, men of eminent ability, sincerely desirous to do their full duty in their respective positions; men who in other pursuits or who on non-Catholic journals might win their way to fortune and fame, yet who receive a meagre compensation. They are *overworked*, for no one or two or three men can properly and thoroughly do the work that is comprehended in an *ideal* Catholic newspaper as we have sketched it. Yet the ideal is not, emphatically *not*, a visionary or impractical one.

Were it necessary to give sharper point to what we have written, we might easily do it. We could name at least ten or twelve Protestant journals, which, as respects numerical strength of editorial staff, number of regular contributors and correspondents, scholarly work, careful thought, and painstaking, discriminating labor employed on them, contrast most forcibly and favorably with even the very best of our Catholic newspapers. In the respects mentioned they are incomparably superior to almost every, if not to every,

Catholic newspaper in our country. It is unpleasant to say this; it is unpleasant to you to hear it; but, unhappily, it is true.

Whose fault is all this? Is it that of the owners or business managers of Catholic newspapers? To the latter question we answer, No. There are exceptions, but, as a rule, we believe that the current supposition is entirely false. The fault lies at the door of the *Catholic public.* And we believe that our intelligent, educated Catholics are *most to blame* as regards this. They expend for themselves and their families, ten, twenty, fifty dollars on non-Catholic publications for every two or five dollars that they expend on Catholic periodicals or newspapers. Converse with one of these intelligent, educated Catholics. He tells you he is deeply interested in some special subject which directly concerns the interests of the church or some movement in favor of or against the church. Hand to him a Catholic newspaper, or monthly, or quarterly, which contains an interesting article from a Catholic writer of distinguished ability on that very subject—say from Cardinal Manning or Cardinal Newman. He thanks you warmly; he will read it with great pleasure; not now; he has not time; but soon. The article could be read in five minutes. It is placed on his table; perhaps it speedily finds its way unread, into his waste basket, or it is labelled carefully, placed where it may be easily found; and then it is forgotten. Meanwhile he and his family consume hours every day in reading non-Catholic newspapers and periodicals, some of which contain things which every Catholic should conscientiously abstain from reading. This is no fancy sketch. Every observing Catholic writer knows that it is true.

As regards Catholic young men and young women, and Catholics of the less educated class, it is notorious that they spend dollars for sensational, trashy "story papers" and novels, where they spend five cents for a Catholic newspaper.

There is still another class; Catholics who attend to their religious duties, and take a daily or weekly non-Catholic paper for the sake of reading the "news," but who take no Catholic newspaper, no Catholic journal or periodical of any description; who are content to be as ignorant as "a heathen" of all that is going on in the Catholic Church, outside of their own parish, who hear and know nothing whatever of what is going on even in their own diocese, who know nothing whatever about what the church is doing throughout our country, or in Europe, Asia, or Africa; nothing whatever about the movements of its enemies, nothing about what it is doing in defence of the truth and for the welfare of society, nothing whatever about its great charitable and missionary operations. The Holy Father might be tortured or murdered or driven from Rome, and they would remain ignorant of it until told of it by some better informed fellow-Catholic, or by some sneering, scoffing non-Catholic acquaintance.

The Catholic newspaper press *cannot* be what it ought to be, and what it might be, until it is much more generally and generously sustained. This we state emphatically as a self-evident fact.

To obtain these, the owners, managers and editors of Catholic

newspapers must, as a necessary perequisite and despite their limited resources, strenuously strive to make their respective journals more worthy of support than very many of them now are.

Where are we to look for a remedy? We reply unhesitatingly, *to the Catholic clergy*. Without their *active*, *practical* assistance, owners, managers, and editors of Catholic newspapers will labor in vain to secure for their publications the support they ought to have, and which, for the proper promotion of Catholic interests it is necessary for them to have. We have the good will of the Catholic clergy so far as general approval and desire for our success go; but these are not enough. We need, we require their earnest, active efforts to increase the circulation of Catholic newspapers in every one of their respective parishes.

Our Holy Father has blessed Catholic writers and their work, and especially Catholic journalists. The fathers of the third plenary council of Baltimore have repeated that blessing. They declare that those of them who give themselves faithfully to the work are worthy of all praise, and that their memory will be held in benediction. They desire that their numbers and strength shall daily increase. They desire that the circulation of Catholic journals shall be greatly enlarged. But these same fathers also declare in their pastoral address:

"But all this will be only words in the air, unless it can be brought home to each parent and made practical in each household. If the head of each Catholic family will recognize it as his privilege and his duty to contribute toward supporting the Catholic press by subscribing for one or more Catholic periodicals and keeping himself well acquainted with the information they impart, then the Catholic press will be sure to attain its rightful development and to accomplish its destined mission."

Who can reach the heads of Catholic families—reach them effectively? The Catholic press, using its best efforts, employing the most successful canvassers, *cannot*. We mean cannot without the active assistance of our prelates and clergy. Even with their assistance it will be a difficult work. We have the testimony of worthy, zealous priests who have energetically labored to increase the circulation of Catholic newspapers in their respective parishes, that their efforts were attended with but little succees. Yet, difficult as the work is, it must be undertaken, continued, and persevered in, until success crowns, as success eventually will crown it, if it be thus carried on. For until this work is accomplished, the Catholic press of our country, to a great extent, will fail to fulfil its high mission, but when it shall have been accomplished, then will our Catholic periodical press become, as our Holy Father, Leo XIII, urges it should strive to become—a most efficient and potent instrumentality for advancing the highest interests of society and defending the church. (Applause.)

MR. McGLOIN'S PAPER.

The Catholic Church has for its mission to save souls; to that end, she labors to render men believing and moral. Every agency, therefore, affecting human belief, or human conduct, interests her deeply.

No one ignores the vast influence of the press. The 16,319 periodicals of the United States, with their 33,260,750 subscribers, are a potent factor in moulding the opinions and sentiments of our people. Sentiment and opinion govern a nation; and, usually, they rule also the individual. They constitute a moral force of first magnitude. Brave and pure public sentiment indicates a brave and pure people; one which is corrupt bespeaks a populace, itself corrupted.

The press, by reason of its influence over the popular mind and heart, challenges in an especial manner the attention of the church. So far as it is capable of accomplishing, and does accomplish, evil, it is to be combatted; so far as it is an instrument for working widespread and enduring good, it is to be seized upon and put to its fullest use. Considering the gigantic proportions to which the press has attained in this country, it would seem that, as yet, the church has not accomplished a great deal in the way of enlisting its services in her own particular behalf. Out of the 16,319 periodicals published in all the United States, about 100 only are in the particular service of the Catholic Church. Of the remaining mass, a large proportion is distinctly anti-Catholic, including Protestant, Jewish, and infidel publications, and a considerable number of secular ones. What remains cannot, from the strictly Catholic standpoint, be regarded as with us. The Catholic Church is the church of authority and discipline, and of resulting spiritual unity. The non-Catholic press, as a rule, is antagonistic to the idea of authority in matters spiritual; and its influence is strongly against religious unity. In pursuit of the sensational, the secular press opens its columns to matter against faith and morals; and such matter it introduces into the innermost family circle. In addition, there is to accomplish this same work, an increasing flood of romances, novels, novelettes, dramas, etc.; all anti-Catholic, more or less, in expression or sentiment. The result of all is that the task of the church is rendered far more difficult and laborious.

If the church finds herself at such disadvantage in this regard, it is because her children are not yet practically awakened to the importance of this matter. Sentimentally they are with the Catholic journal; but, when it comes to subscribing and advertising, too many of them place their patronage elsewhere. There are large business establishments in New Orleans owned in whole or part by Catholics, some of which advertise largely in secular prints, who turn the cold shoulder to the solicitors of our Catholic journals. It is the same in other places. In the great city of New York, there is a Jewish journal, rated at less than 4,000 circulation, which, nevertheless, shows in its columns fifty-three distinct advertisers, having names undoubtedly Irish, and hence presumably Catholic.

It is needless to state that the same names are strangers to the columns of the New York Catholic journals, although many of the latter have many times larger circulations than the Hebrew periodical already referred to. When it comes to subscribing, compare the aggregate of circulation for all the Catholic journals of our Union with the millions known to belong to the church in this country, and it will be surprising to observe what a large proportion of our American Catholic population there is which does absolutely nothing for Catholic journalism.

If Catholic journals were of inferior character, or if advertising in their columns were waste of money, such a state of affairs would be justifiable. But, as a rule, Catholic publications are fully up to the standard. As to advertising, other things equal, they furnish a medium which is exceptionally excellent. All taking such journals do so because of a special interest in the cause they serve. Such publications, therefore, have the particular affections of their readers, all of whom are deeply interested in their success. Advertisers contribute largely to the maintenance of a journal; hence, they are in a sense coöperators in the work such journal is accomplishing. This should be a bond of sympathy between reader and advertiser, of the greatest value to the latter.

Our American Catholic population, as a mass, is devoted and generous. The numerous and magnificent churches and schools and charitable institutions of all kinds which they have erected and are maintaining, afford convincing proof of this. The difficulty is, as already intimated, that our people are not yet awake to the necessity under which the church is, of a strong Catholic press, to serve as an antidote to all which is poisonous in the anti-Catholic press, as also in anti-Catholic literature; and to serve as a powerful and faithful assistant of the Catholic pulpit, in the dissemination of truth. So soon as our people are thoroughly aroused in the premises, then shall we see the Catholic press growing into splendid proportions.

It is high time for earnest Catholics to enter upon the work of dissipating this lethargy. The same piety which is building and maintaining churches, schools, and institutions, must take the Catholic press into favor; it must expend a portion of its zeal in this direction. It should be no longer possible to say of excellent Catholic men and women that they are zealous and charitable in every quarter, but for Catholic journalism they are without the slightest concern. Money and labor expended in behalf of the Catholic press is well and nobly expended, and must be highly meritorious in the sight of Almighty God. The rich should give of their substance, either by way of contribution or advertising, and even the poor should assist at least by subscribing for some one Catholic periodical.

The simplest consideration must satisfy all of the truth of these observations, and history may be appealed to for further enforcement. All are aware of the frightful work accomplished, not many generations ago, by Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert, and a horde of other atheists and disorganizers. Infidelity and the spirit of revolution were disseminated within a remarkably short

space of time, over the whole civilized world. Religion and civil authority, as well, were shaken to their very foundations. Christian belief was wounded almost unto death, and even to these days the grievous wounds then inflicted are not healed.

The wonder is, how these men accomplished, in so short a space of time, such immense and hideous results. History informs us that they seized for this purpose upon the printing press, sending forth a flood of evil writings to poison the minds and hearts of the people. We may now consider another, and to us Catholics a more grateful picture. I refer to the glorious and yet recent victory achieved by brave German Catholics over the great iron chancellor, Bismarck. It is conceded, that, under God, this speedy and brilliant victory is due in large part to the German Catholic press. Had Germany, in the days of Martin Luther, such a Catholic press as now she has, and which aided so nobly in abating the latest Kulturkampf, there would never have been any effective or enduring German Protestantism. Had there been in France, during the sad days of Voltaire, a strong Christian press to disseminate swiftly and afar the truth, atheism would never have snatched away so many souls to perdition.

Considering the potency of the press, we may rest assured that Almighty God did not disclose it to mankind in order that it might serve mainly as an instrument of evil. In his own good time he will establish his invincible dominion over it, and bend its principal force into the service of religion. It is not out of place to speculate with humble spirit upon the visible methods which it is possible he may employ to this end. Indeed, it may even be that he himself shall inspire, during the course of such reflection, a happy thought which shall serve to point the way his servants are to take, in order to bring about a speedier accomplishment of his holy designs.

Mother church in the past has had many up-springing evils to combat, as now she has a strong anti-Catholic printing press to deal with. She has always found effective weapons for warfare. Various heresies have been occasions for the founding of magnificent preaching orders; the attempt to force Godless education upon her children, has brought forward the powerful and spreading teaching bodies which are winning for the church a position of dominance in the educational field.

May we not have here the key to our whole situation? Why should the church not meet this particular evil as she has met so many others in the past, by the establishment of religious orders, whose special mission shall be the upbuilding of a great Catholic press and publishing interest? A journal in our day is an expensive affair. Editor, reporter, type-writer, solicitor, carrier, all must be paid; and the outgo is something the magnitude of which requires experience in order to appreciate it.

We have noble religious orders, which give their time to cultivating the earth, others to preaching, others to educating, and so on. Those composing such orders labor for no earthly reward; the enterprises, therefore in which they engage are not mortgaged to Mammon. These orders and religious bodies have their particular

missions, already clearly defined, and the great works in which they are engaged demand now as earnestly as ever their untiring devotion. It is not to be expected that they shall now enter upon new and different courses. Nor would it be adequate for any order or body to adopt this new mission as a secondary or collateral work. We are dealing with a matter of primary importance; and to build up Catholic publication to the proportions peremptorily demanded, in order that it may grapple with a mighty foe in every place and upon every field, demands the entire as well as the best efforts of all who may undertake the great and glorious work.

It is possible, nay probable, that Almighty God will soon inspire generous hearts to devote themselves, as in other fields others have done and still are doing, to Catholic journalistic and publishing work. The church would then be emancipated from the crushing expense which now stands as a bar in the way. She could plant her journals and erect her publishing houses in every locality, just as now she is planting everywhere her colleges, academies, and schools. She could flood the land with clean and Catholic reading, at prices which deny refusal.

Of course, the secular and non-Catholic press, and non-Catholic publishing interests in general, can always take care of themselves as now they are doing. But, alongside of the already immense non-Catholic publishing interests, would grow up speedily a Catholic one, to become with time equally as great and well capable of defending the cause of Catholicism in its every respect. We would have the two presses side by side, as we now have two school systems, ramifying everywhere throughout the land.

These ideas are probably not original with the writer. Others may or may not have thought them and even made them public. All that the writer desired was to cast them forth before this great representative body, to be taken for what they are worth. Perchance, they may float afar, and finding somewhere a congenial soil, with God's grace, spring into life, and bring forth with time fair fruit. Should this, through the providence of God, arise in his day, the writer, with certain friends, would hope to be placed in early communication with the movement, so that, according to their means and state of life, they might be among the number of its earliest friends and helpers

MILTON E. SMITH'S ADDRESS.

Mr. President and Gentlemen: I desire, with your permission, to make a few remarks relative to the paper on the Catholic press, which has just been read; a paper prepared by a gentleman who, from education and experience, is amply qualified to discuss and criticise Catholic publications. That they are not the ideals which every Catholic, and especially every Catholic editor, desires, cannot be refuted. However, when we pass judgment upon the efforts of those who in conducting the Catholic press are standing in the front ranks of controversy, giving and receiving blows in defence

of our holy mother church, we should not forget the relative condition of Catholic literature to-day and at the time the mitre was first placed upon the brow of the illustrious Archbishop Carroll. One hundred years ago Catholic publications were restricted by the prejudice and bigotry which for three centuries environed English Catholics and weighed down English Catholic literature. To-day all this has been changed, and we have Catholic books in the English language without number, whilst Catholic newspapers are within the reach of all. Considering the shadows from which English Catholic literature has recently emerged, we must not demand too much from Catholic writers or Catholic publishers; but whilst urging them to strive to reach the highest plane of excellence we should inform the people generally that the Catholic press stands in need not only of material assistance, but especially of moral support. We must not forget that the Catholic newspaper caters for a different constituency from that of the magazines or reviews, consequently it can reach an ideal plane only when the masses become more highly cultivated. In spite of all its environments the Catholic press has done a grand work in aiding to carry the cross over our prairies, up the side of the mountains towards the setting sun. It has ever proved loyal to the church and loyal to him, who, though a prisoner by the classic banks of the Tiber, robbed of his patrimony, stripped by an infamous government of possessions to which he has a clearer title than any monarch of Europe, has never failed to raise his voice in defence of those eternal principles of liberty which were first declared on the soil of this grand old commonwealth on which we now stand. By the aid of the Catholic press, noble cathedrals have been erected in our cities, beautiful churches in less populous centres, and hundreds of chapels on the sides of our mountains, where the holy missionary, in torn and faded vestments, celebrates the same holy sacrifice offered beneath the venerable basilicas of the eternal city. If the Catholic press has been true in the past to its great mission, we may hope that, with the dawn of the new era which is ushered in by the one hundredth anniversary of the consecration of Bishop Carroll, it will go forward fearless in its support of all the rights of Catholics and non-Catholics, and bold, yet prudent, in demanding the freedom of the Holy See.

William L. Kelly, of St. Paul, Minn., said: *Most Reverend Fathers, Mr. President and Gentlemen of the First Catholic Congress of the United States:* You have listened on behalf of the Catholic press, to words from a gentleman who comes to you from the far south, and has spoken in language as warm as the waters of the glorious gulf that encircles his Crescent City, and with a force equal to its billows. (Applause.) Will you listen patiently to a stranger who comes to you from the far north, from that city bearing the name of the apostle to the gentiles, that city that stands like a queen at the head waters of the Mississippi? (Applause.) I

have asked your patience, for I tell you as an honest man in advance, that some things I may say here may not have the same ring to them that have been expressed in articles before mine upon the same subject. When His Grace the archbishop of St. Paul (applause), whom I consider it an honor to say is my friend, sent for me and told me that upon this occasion I would be expected to address this august body, upon a subject so vital, so pregnant, and so burning as that of education in these United States, and realizing the tremendous responsibility of the task that he was then placing upon me, and realizing my utter unfitness for that responsibility, I said to him, "Sir, it is impossible," what was the answer? He turned away from me as Napoleon Bonaparte turned from his chief engineer, after he had laid out a route for crossing the Alps, and when the engineer had reached the foot of the Alps told him that the route was not practicable, he said, "Well, that is all settled, we will push forward at once." And so Archbishop Ireland said to me, "I am glad it is all settled; you will read the paper." (Laughter and applause.) So I am here to read it. The mistakes are all mine; lay them upon my unworthy shoulders; that which is good in this paper apply to my holy mother, the Catholic Church.

MR. KELLY'S PAPER.

In that act "done by the United States in congress assembled, the 13th day of July, A.D. 1787, and of their sovereignty and independence the 12th" entitled, "An ordinance for the government of the territory northwest of the river Ohio," I read these articles, as the law of the land.

"No person demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner, shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship, or religious sentiments in said territories. * * *

"There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted. * * *

"*Religion, morality, and knowledge*, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, *schools and the means of education* shall forever be encouraged."

Virginia, great-hearted mother of states, had just ceded to the Union this northwest territory. Out of it were to be created the commonwealths of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and in large part Minnesota, with every foot of their glorious soil thus made consecrate forever to freedom, to knowledge, and to God. As our fathers pledged all futurity that never within those borders should any peaceable and orderly person be questioned for his religious faith or practice, and as they set apart that land for all time, to be the home of free men and forbade slavery therein, so they linked in a trinity of beauty and of power to be then and thenceforward

fostered and encouraged, these three essentials to good government and human happiness, religion, morality, and knowledge.

O, lawgivers of the past! O, prophets of the voiceless future! a good angel inspired you to write these words in this ancient charter! In point of time it precedes the United States constitution. Before the constitution was adopted and the government of law formed under it began, this charter had fixed for all time the status of a great people. And when the infidel tells me in his scoffing, or the timid Christian cries out in his fear that God's name is not found in the constitution of my country, I answer that before the constitution was, God's inspiration and spirit had breathed into this organic law, and it became a living thing, and that from it that spirit has passed into every constitution in the land.

Those were brave words, bravely spoken. They should be written in letters of gold on every law book — on every text book of the schools — they should be treasured in every heart. What is still better, our policies should conform to this law, both in the letter and in the spirit. If we have followed in the right path, we should continue therein. If mistakes have been made, they should be corrected.

The *lawgivers* said, that religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good goverment and the happiness of mankind. They were choice and vigorous in their language. It is just as though it was written, that without religion, morality, and knowledge, good government is impossible. But why did they add that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" unless they understood that in the schools all these essentials to human happiness should be taught? While this ordinance applied in terms only to the territory northwest of the Ohio, yet it was the legally expressed will of the whole people. It was your law, gentlemen, from New England and from the middle and southern and western states, as well as ours, inhabitants of the northwest territory. Again, what was then and what to-day is this northwest territory? When this law was written, all that land was untrodden by white men's feet, save where the armed men in the service of France and England had pressed the gatherers of gold into the wilderness, or where those gatherers of souls in God's service, the Catholic priests, without sword or script, had carried the eternal cross far beyond the armed outposts of these two great nations. Though the forests were dark and trackless, though the rivers, broad and deep, though the great lakes stood as insurmountable barriers in their way, though savage red men met them at every turn, though death at the hands of more savage white men shadowed them every step, in spite of all these, and heeding only the Master's command, "Go, teach all nations," the intrepid members of the company of Jesus had carried the story of Calvary northward to the head waters of Lake Superior, westward to the Mississippi, and southward to the Arkansas. From the ocean westward they had breathed upon the waters, and the Catholic names they bear to-day attest their presence.

They laid their holy hands upon the heart of the wilderness, and it throbbed, responsive to their touch.

The most of them stepped from the martyr's stake up to the throne of God. Their names passed, for a time, from the common talk of the people. But, after the lapse of the centuries, the glorious Catholic harvest that has sprung from the ground they trod has proven again, if it needs be, that "the blood of the martyr is the seed of the church."

From about 3,000,000 people at the time of the ordinance, the country has grown to about 60,000,000. Within the limits of the northwest territory now are at least one-fourth the entire population. One-third of the nation's wealth is there. One-fourth of the railroad mileage, and over one-fourth of the school children. And last, but not least to us, about one-fourth the entire Catholic people. This in an area embracing only five states and part of a sixth, of this Union.

We have seen, by a logical deduction from the reason which the fathers gave for the law, what they understood by the term education. Of course, in its comprehensive sense, education is not limited by that which is learned in the schools. It begins at the mother's knee and ends with the grave. All life is educational, and some of the hardest and most useful lessons are those of experience. What, then, in its ordinary meaning, is education? What is the ultimate object of education? How is that object best attained?

These questions are suggestive each of a weighty problem,—problems that have engaged the earnest thought of the ablest minds of our own country and the world. In this discussion, two great parties have arisen,—both agreeing that education should be general and for the people, the one holding that this popular education must be entirely secular, the other maintaining that no education is worth the having that is not founded upon religion and morals. Holding the latter view are found first the entire Catholic Church, numbering in her fold about one-sixth of the whole people. To these should be added a large and most respectable minority of our Protestant brethren, notably the Episcopal and Lutheran churches, and a very large contingent from all the other Protestant Christian bodies. That a solution of this question absolutely satisfactory to the Christian peoples of these states and good to the nation has not been reached, is due largely, I add in passing, First, to the absence of positive fairness on each side in the discussion. Second, to the prejudice against or fear of the Catholic Church still honestly entertained by many of our Protestant brethren. Third, to the activity of the infidel and indifferentist in using these fears and prejudices, and by thus dividing upon a question vital to both, the great Christian bodies, Catholic and Protestant, shaping the school policies of the land to their own ends.

Upon the general subject of education it is hard to add anything to the world's stock of ideas. Shakespeare said, "There is nothing new under the sun." It seems that on this vexed question so much has been written and said, that the fields have been so thoroughly reaped by skilled hands that little is left for a mere gleaner on the by-ways. But truth is always new, though many times presented. Therefore, do not harshly criticise me should I tread in well beaten paths.

We can best determine what education means, or rather, what it ought to mean, by asking the question, Why was man created? The catechism says, That he may know God, love him, and serve him in this world and be happy with him forever in the next. Every Christian will acknowledge this as a verity. If, then, the ultimate object of man's creation, and his residence on this earth is his eternal salvation, it follows as a logical sequence that whatever tends most directly to that end is best for man. And as none can question that the development and training in the child of the intellectual and moral nature within him is by far the most important step in his life, and tends most directly either to make or mar his future for time and eternity, so it follows that it is all-important that this developing and training process be not one-sided and imperfect, but that it be thorough, all-embracing, and honest. Education means, necessarily, the imparting of knowledge, therefore, that knowledge which is most essential to man's happiness, here and hereafter, should be imparted *first*, and should certainly not be replaced by other things less important. The knowledge of God embraces the knowledge of the duties man owes to God, to his neighbor, and to himself. These, it seems to me, are the first essentials of education. With these any man can be, and usually will be, a good man, a good neighbor, a good citizen. Without these he can never become either.

I can illustrate: One day, upon a trial of some importance, a bright boy of tender years was introduced to a court as a witness. It was supposed the little fellow could give important testimony, perhaps bearing heavily upon the interests of one of the parties litigant. So the attorney for that party challenged the capacity of the child to testify, being too young to understand the nature of an oath. The judge opened a catechism class of one, and after asking a few indifferent questions to get the full attention of the proposed witness, asked: "Who made you, Johnny?" "God made me, sir," was the prompt reply. "Why did God make you, my boy?" "That I may know him and love him and serve him in this world and be happy with him forever in the next," was the answer. "Your Honor," said the opposing lawyer, "I withdraw all objection, and waive the oath." He knew instinctively, as we all do, that this little witness would tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth. To my mind, that child's education had been commenced right.

Webster, defining the word, says, "Education is properly to draw forth, and implies not so much the communication of knowledge as the discipline of the intellect, the establishment of the principles, *and the regulation of the heart*"—to develop the whole man, to lead him out from the darkness into light, to store, but not to crowd the memory with useful data; to quicken and discipline the reasoning powers; to render the mind apt to the acquisition of knowledge in the future as time affords opportunity; but above all and first of all, to develop the moral and religious faculties. In a word, to make him conscious of his God-given powers, and humble and grateful in the ever-presence of the Giver, is to educate. Our

fathers understood this well when they said "Schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged," because "religion, morality, and knowledge," the three essentials to perfect education, are "necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind."

Self-preservation is the first law of nature. This law applies as well to states as to individuals. Want of conscience with the lettered, and ignorance with the masses are twin enemies of social order. This is especially true in the republic when so much depends upon an intelligent intellect dominated by a conscientious will. The records of the courts show far more of the darker crimes against the state committed by polished scoundrels than by unlettered and simple men. Against these the state has the right to protect itself. But how? Not, surely, by teaching the arts of reading, writing, and ciphering, nor by adding geography, history, grammar, and the like, *ad infinitum*. These alone cannot protect the state; there must be religion, morals, and manners taught. Why should the state hesitate to teach in its schools that which every day it publishes broadcast in its laws and enforces from its bench? Every time the state punishes homicide, or larceny, or perjury, or any other of the common law crimes, it enforces one or the other of the ten commandments of God. Why not teach the children that they shall be truthful because Jehovah hath said, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor"? Teach them to be honest, not because "Honesty is the best policy," but because it is a commandment of God.

But it is said this is but the natural law of right and wrong, and requires no positive religious teaching. Let us see. A child is detected in a lie and punished. The child may be puzzled to understand whether the punishment is because of the lie, or because he is caught. Therefore, the teacher explains it is sinful to lie, but the child asks, Why is it sinful? The answer will be, Because God has commanded men to speak the truth. But the child does not know who God is, and by what authority he commands men. And farther on, he may wish to know how God can enforce his commands. These simple and logical questions must be answered. So at once in the inculcation of the simplest of the moral precepts — call it the natural law, or what you will — the teacher must impart the positive truths of revealed religion, or be silent in the presence of a questioning child. I say there is no escape. He must teach positive religion if he teach morals, and if he does not teach morals, *he cheats the child of an inalienable right to be fully educated.*

Epictetus wrote, more than 1,800 years ago, "You will do the greatest service to the state if you shall raise, not the roofs of the houses, but the souls of the citizens; for it is better that great souls should dwell in small houses rather than for mean slaves to lurk in great palaces."

And this is voiced by an American poet of our day:

> "God give us men!
> Men whom the lust of office cannot buy—
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot kill.
> Tall men, sun-crowned."

Sweet singer of my country, God gives us plastic material out of which men like these may be fashioned. But a mistaken system of education dwarfs them in the rearing. You dwarf them with too much materialism. You develop and quicken the brain, but leave the heart, where conscience dwells, an uncultivated waste. Hence, in some measure at least, your *unanswered* cry for *sun-crowned* men.

The fathers in the ordinance of 1787, outlined a correct model. For over half a century the nation followed that plan. This is aptly expressed by a Protestant writer, Mr. Washington Gladden, in the *Century Magazine* for April, 1886. Mr. Gladden says:

"That popular education, as it exists in this country, is the offspring of the religious sentiment, is matter of history. But, like many another unfilial child, education has shown a strong disposition of late to disown and desert her mother. The tendency has been gaining strength to withdraw education from all association with religion, to eliminate religion wholly from education, and to claim for education all the saving virtues of which society has need. There are those who think that the diffusion of science and literature will prove a sufficient agency for the promotion of the welfare of the state, and that the learning thus diffused may be but must be separated from everything that bears the semblance of religion."

Continuing, the writer speaks of the religious atmosphere that pervaded the schools in his early days, and refers, with gratitude, to the "impressions made upon our lives in the school room of our early days." But he sadly adds, "All this has been rapidly changing; and contemporaneously, it is discovered that something is wrong with society. Grave dangers menace its peace; ugly evils infest its teeming population; pauperism is increasing. * * * Crime is increasing."

Nor does the writer content himself with mere assertion, which it would seem, so patent is the truth, would go with the saying. He proves his allegations by statistics from no less a state than Massachusetts, and from the ranks of the native-born citizens alone. The ratio of crime to native population he says has in that state doubled in the last thirty years. "And this," says Mr. Gladden, "be it remembered, is in Massachusetts — the state in which education of every kind, public and private, has been longer established, and is more magnificently endowed and more thoroughly administered than in any other state of the Union. Massachusetts expends, through her public schools for the tuition of every pupil enumerated in her school population, nearly $16 a year. Added to this public provision is the great array of universities, colleges, academies, and seminaries, amply endowed, far surpassing those of every other state in number and in excellence. What education can do to promote morality has been more thoroughly done for Massachusetts than for any other American state. Nevertheless, the statistics show an alarming increase of the vicious and dependent classes in Massachusetts. There is no room for supposing that the case of Massachusetts is any worse than that of the younger commonwealths. Those who have had opportunity for observing the conditions of society, east and west, will not be inclined to believe that

the morals of the old Bay State are any lower than those of New York, Ohio, or Illinois. If other states would collect the facts as carefully, and publish them as fully, we should see similar conditions existing everywhere." In order that these quotations may be verified, I refer to the *Century*, Vol. IX, pp 938, 939, art., "Christianity and Popular Education." I agree with Mr. Gladden that the defects in the public schools are *not alone* responsible for this sad condition. Many other causes concur. But a defective educational system must answer for a part of the moral decadence thus noticed.

Now I refer to these facts not in reviling, but in sorrow; for, like Mr. Gladden, I love my country next my God, and I love her magnificent public school system in spite of all its defects. *Those defects can be cured. They will be cured.*

To say that a system builded with so much care — from the humble beginning of the revolutionary period to the splendid reality of the present — with the best known teaching plans — with an army of skillful and accomplished teachers, men and women — with materal appointments unequalled in the world — disbursing over $115,000,000 annually, and teaching daily over 7,500,000 scholars,—to say that such a system, defective as it is in one vital particular, should be destroyed or even crippled, is madness, *and no one but a madman will advocate such a course.* No! No! From the humblest log cabin in the remote frontier to the grandest high school in our crowded cities, these schools are monuments of the patience and the patriotism of the people. They are the schools of the democracy — I mean it in its broad, not in its party sense. In them as in holy church, is taught the *absolute equality and brotherhood of man. Bring back to their teaching positive religion, so that the children may appreciate the fatherhood of God, and we have the perfect school, and the perfect school system as far as human frailty will permit.*

Again it is urged that the state being absolutely neutral (not to say indifferent), on matters of religious faith, cannot teach religion in its schools for the reason that to do so would be to violate the fundamental law which guarantees absolute freedom of conscience to every citizen. Now this objection is more plausible than real. While the Protestant body is unhappily divided into many denomitions, there are not such radical differences in the dogmatic doctrines of each from the other that they cannot for all practical purposes be called one body. So that we have the Christian community divided into Catholic and Protestant. Of the non-Christian people there are but two divisions — Israelites and unbelievers. No man can convince me that the honest, earnest, ingenious, and fertile American brain cannot, if it wills, or will not, when the time comes, discover a way to have religion and morals taught in the public schools, *openly and honestly taught*, and thus answer the crying need of the state for self-protection, *without offending the conscience of Catholic or Protestant, Israelite or infidel.* The question has been solved in other communities—Canada, for example; it can be solved in ours. I leave *the when and the how* of this question to my separated brethren, for in a certain sense they are more interested than

we Catholics; because Catholics have already, as far as their children are concerned, solved it for themselves, by providing their own separate schools. I point my Christian brethren outside the church to the fact that the ranks of infidelity are almost wholly recruited from their churches. Is it not the absence of positive religious teaching in the public schools, which is thus destroying in their children the faith of their fathers? Are the children of the Pilgrims to-day the same sturdy, unbending Christians as were their sires? If they are not, why are they not? Let honest Protestants answer these questions — there can be but one answer — and apply the remedy.

I have said these evils will be remedied. I am no prophet, but I have faith. They will be remedied by that solid, good, common sense and patriotism inherent in the American people and in our republican system that has so far remedied, successfully, great evils that seemed to threaten the life of the state.

They will be remedied by that reaction that is now going on among our separated brethren who already see the threatening danger. They will be remedied by that pure Christian sentiment that is all-pervading in this land. For despite all scoffers may say, or pessimists fear, we *are* a Christian people.

What that Christian sentiment is, and as applied to the problem of popular education, I cannot forbear quoting some vigorous language from Rev. L. O. Brastow, a Protestant divine, which I find in the *Catholic World* of June, 1884, and there credited to the *New Englander* of January previous. In an article entitled, "The Religious Factor in Education," Mr. Brastow says:

"Education is nothing less than the development and training of all the potencies that have been lodged in man. It concerns itself with the full contents of his being and with all his possibilities. The claims of education are precisely the claims of manhood. If the idea of manhood be low, the product of training will be meagre and inadequate. The claims of religion upon education are precisely the claims of a complete manhood. If a man is worth educating at all he is worth educating roundly as a man. If the capacity of religion belongs to his manhood it is a crime against that manhood to ignore its rights and cripple its possibilities.

"So long as man is forced by the necessities of his own being to recognize a power which is other and more than himself and other and more than the universe in which he lives, so long religion will hold its supremacy. This meagre world power can never successfully displace that which represents what lies beyond the world.

"There were nothing to educate or cultivate if there were not already presupposed an original God-consciousness as its practical basis and condition. A higher world and a higher power thrust themselves into the fore-front of all our investigation of this lower world and all lower orders of existence.

"Man must be trained to the utmost of his capacity, and that means that he must be trained religiously. Education can never suppress nor displace religion. It can only pervert it, and in doing

so perverts itself. Its highest aim is to develop religion into fulness of significance and power.

"Religion will not take itself out of the way; cannot be explained out of existence; cannot be trained into permanent silence; will not be ignored and cannot be majestically put to confusion by the power of intellectual arrogance. If religion were only a coördinate factor in our education it would demand all that any other factor demands, for its rights are as great, and an education that would crowd it out of recognition would only be a garbled and false, and so a dangerous education. Even those who allow it no greater dignity or significance than belongs to a product of feeling and imagination clearly see this. But if religion represents the realm of the absolute, and is the central and imperative power in man, the case is other and more. Religion does not come into man's consciousness simply as the product of his thought. It is not a product of the intellectual activity in its speculation upon the origin of all things, as rationalism claims. It is not a theoretic, but a practical power. It is more than knowledge of the infinite. It is knowledge realized as obligation * * * Religion, therefore, as an authority from the realm of the absolute, claims the whole man.

"Religion, then, is the root of manhood, as well as its crown, and all rational and systematic development must proceed from this centre. A something there must be in man which is to him what life is in the development of organism. This something is the religious factor in him. Only as religion finds place in the growth and development of manhood do we attain symmetry and completeness."

These defects in our popular system will be remedied in part by that splendid example set by the Catholic Church in her educational system. Begun in poverty — maintained in spite of open threats and covert sneers, builded upon the sure foundation rock of authority, teaching always duty to God, first, and after that duty to country and to kind — it has grown with the nation's growth and prospered with the nation's years. And all this while the Catholic citizen has cheerfully been doing double duty. Paying his quota of the public taxes for schools, he has out of his poverty built up and endowed his own schools. What they are these imperfect figures from the *Catholic Directory* of 1889 will demonstrate. The total Catholic population is estimated at 10,000,000. The number of parochial schools *reported* is 3,024; academies, 546; seminaries, 27; colleges, 97; charitable institutions, 519. The number of scholars *reported* in the parochial schools was 585,965, with several dioceses unreported. By adding to these at a fair average estimate, the number of pupils taught in our academies, colleges, seminaries, and charitable asylums, orphanages, etc., I estimate at least 750,000 as the daily average attendance in the Catholic schools.

Now, the public schools' average daily attendance for the same period was 7,500,000, out of a total population of about 60,000,000. Deducting the Catholic population from the total population of the country, leaves about 50,000,000. The state educates about one-seventh of its people, exclusive of the Catholic body. The Catholic Church educates about one-twelfth of its membership, exclusive of the

state. This grand showing has challenged the admiration of Protestant writers. I quote from *International Educational Series*, Vol. XI, Appleton & Co., 1889, this tribute from the author, Mr. Boone. After noticing the denominational schools of our Protestant brethren, he says: "But all the denominational service in education is partial and irregular compared with the comprehensive grasp of the Catholic Church. Theirs is all-inclusive, and assumes no other agency. Ignoring the public school, their plan is coextensive with their membership. With one-fifth of all the theological seminaries, and one-third of all their students, with one-fourth of the colleges, nearly 600 academies and 2,600 parochial (elementary) schools, instructing more than 500,000 children, the church is seen to be a force which, educationally considered, is equalled by no other single agency but the government itself.

"The Theological Seminary of St. Sulpice, Baltimore, is, according to the *Catholic Year Book*, the oldest organization for theological instruction in this country, dating from 1791. To the Catholics, also, belong several industrial reform schools, orphans' homes, and normal schools." With this splendid testimony of a non-Catholic, and therefore one not partial to Catholic schools, I may well close this, to me unsatisfactory, paper. It has hastily been thrown together in the chance intervals of a very busy, every-day life. Its style is crude, but its sentiments are honest.

With one glance at the past and future, I close.

My Catholic brethren, this to us is a glorious day. Glorious in the splendid promise it gives for the future—glorious in recalling the story of the past. As Catholics, with unsandalled feet, we stand at the cradle of our faith in these United States. As citizens, we have come to the cradle also of civil and religious liberty in the west. With grateful and humble hearts we lay upon God's altars our thanksgiving for his manifold blessings to church and people. With grateful and humble hearts we turn to our country's altar and thank God that he has preserved thereon the fires of freedom which our Carrolls helped to light. Oh, Maryland—thou state of a blessed name—thy land is holy! Thy land is holy—for here the "Ark" bearing the charter of freedom first rested—here the "Dove" of peace among the nation's first found homes. And thou, Baltimore, fair city of this ancient see, how our Catholic pulses start at the mention of thy name! Through the vista of 100 years rises up the figure of thy first bishop, John Carroll—priest, patriot, and patriarch. Down the line of his successors, what glorious names adorn thy annals. To mention some of them is to touch the Catholic heart.—A Kenrick, a Spalding, a Bayley—until the mantle falls upon that man who, it is no flattery to say, stands not alone a prince of the Church Catholic, but a leader of American thought, James, Cardinal Gibbons.

But, to return to my theme, we are dealing not so much with the past as with the living present. The foundations of our Catholic schools have been laid broad and deep. They are not all we desire them to be, but considering the difficulties encountered, they are schools of which we may well be proud.

There is, however, an unknown field for enective educational work which, as I stand before this great assembly of Catholic laymen, I dare not neglect to mention. I refer to the colored people,—to the freedmen of the south. I know those people. I know their hunger for knowledge. I know how docile they are and how patient—how susceptible to good influences. I know these things, for I am a southern man born; and, God forgive me for it, I have had my share of the southern man's foolish prejudices on this subject,—but I have got bravely over them. And I say to you, my brethren of the first Catholic American congress, that we owe it as an act of reparation to those children of a cruel fate to do all we can to lift them out of that darkness, mental or moral, into which they have been plunged through no fault of theirs. Oh, that God would inspire some great-hearted man or woman to undertake this work, some one who has been blessed with this world's abundance, to lead in laying the foundation for the Catholic mission schools for the colored people of the south. When that glorious leader comes, the field will be found ripening for the harvest.

Once in the olden time a Catholic queen pledged her jewels that the adventurous prows of the "world-seeking Genoese" might be turned toward the west. In our day an American girl—uncrowned, but by that royal patent of grace and good will with which God invested her gentle womanhood—endowed with munificent hand our Catholic university at Washington. And when for all time that university shall point heavenward its cross-crowned spires, this deed which she has done will be spoken in memory of her.

And as from that centre of Catholic education the cross of Christ shall be lifted beside Liberty enthroned on the nation's capitol, we, as Catholics and citizens of the republic, see in the one and in the other the perfect promise of freedom here and that freedom wherewith Christ has made us free in our Father's kingdom.

The church shall live by the unfailing promise of her divine founder. The republic lives only through the virtue of her people, promoted, preserved, and perpetuated through "Religion, morality, and knowledge."

THE CHAIRMAN: "*Gentlemen of the Congress:* I am sure that this body will excuse me for one moment and allow me to present to this audience, at their own invitation, His Honor, Ferdinand C. Latrobe, mayor of the city of Baltimore." (Applause.)

MAYOR LATROBE: "*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I am here to-day at your invitation to be present on one of the occasions of the deliberations of the Catholic congress in Baltimore. I did not come to take part in your deliberations. I did not come to make a speech or an address upon this occasion, nor could it be even expected that I should make a speech, because if so I am confident I should have been given some little time for preparation before speaking to such an intelligent audience as I see before me. But I am here officially as the chief executive officer of this city to

bid you welcome to Baltimore. (Applause.) I do not know what attractions our city can offer. I do not know what species of freedom our city can give you, but whatever they are, I assure you they are freely extended, and certainly in the chief city of the state of Maryland, a state founded on the eternal doctrine of religious toleration (applause), every freedom of speech and thought is offered to every one who comes to the city of Baltimore. (Applause.)

"I will be happy to see you all on Thursday afternoon, when we propose to extend a reception at the city hall to the distinguished prelates and lay members of this great Catholic Church, who have honored Baltimore with its selection as the place for the deliberations of its congress. (Applause.)

"I thank you for your kind invitation to me to be present, and if you will permit me I will now become a listener instead of a talker upón this occasion." (Applause.)

The thanks of the congress were tendered Judge Kelly for his address.

SOCIETIES.

SEVENTH REGULAR PAPER, BY HENRY J. SPAUNHORST, OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. President, Most Reverend Prelates, Reverend Clergy, and Gentlemen of the Congress: I very reluctantly accepted the task to prepare and read on this occasion, before such a large and intelligent audience, as I knew this would be, a paper on societies and organizations, fully cognizant of my inability to do justice to that subject, but the committee said I must, hence there was no escape.

When I undertake to speak of societies, it is necessary as a preliminary, to say that I do not mean such organizations which are recognized by the church as strictly religious societies, nor such as confraternities or societies for special devotions, or of piety, nor sodalities and others of that class, which are strictly under the supervision of clerical authorities. I speak of societies such as are charitable in their character, composed of Catholic men, the management of which is generally left in the hands of the members themselves, but their rules being sanctioned by the pastors of the parishes in which they were organized. Of these societies there are a large number. Some of them confine themselves to the labor of visiting indigent and poor families, in giving relief in kind to the needy, or in kind words give advice, encourage and assist them to their self-sustenance and to the practice of Christian life. The means to accomplish this are gathered by voluntary contributions in such manner that neither member knows what his neighbor contributes. Foremost in this laudable work is the St. Vincent de Paul society, also known as St. Vincent Brotherhood, with its con-

ferences scattered all over the United States, with its particular, upper, and general councils well established.

Next to this organization I would mention the different societies having for their special objects to provide homes for the orphans and parentless, in which to shelter and educate the orphans. Next, such organizations which take charge of the wayward and neglected, or abandoned children, conducting refuges and reformatories. Then follow organizations providing for the old, infirm, and sick, conducting hospitals and homes for that class. All these are societies, organizations, and institutions which have been established in every part of the country where there are Catholics, each and every one working with such means as they can command, in the direction of the objects to be obtained by them.

All such societies do great good to mankind, and are laudable, but their good works are sometimes unknown to the public. The members of these societies are particularly mindful of the words of our Redeemer, when he said: "The poor and needy you have always with you," the teachings of our church being the incentive for membership. It is to do good, aid and comfort thy neighbor, to clothe and feed the needy for God's sake, is their aim, for which is promised reward in this life, and stores of treasures for the life hereafter.

There are other classes of societies which must not be underestimated, because they too, are engaged in objects so laudable and necessary, filling a want in the parishes, to which I deem it proper on this occasion to make special reference; I mean the so-called school and parochial societies, their object being to enable the parish in which they exist, by the voluntary contributions of the members, to support their schools, and to take up all the children for schooling, giving them not only free tuition and schooling, but also, in many cases, furnish books and clothing and other necessaries which hide their indigency, and thus enable them to appear as others, and reap the same benefits. I have no statistics of the works of these societies or institutions; there has not, to my knowledge, been any plan adopted by which reports or statistics could be gathered to show up the immense amount of good such societies are doing. I can only say that where such societies do exist, the amount of good done is manifold, and it is to be regretted that such societies do not exist in every parish.

You will permit me to digress from my subject for a moment, to acknowledge and pay tribute due the many religious orders, whose members voluntarily choose a life of self-denial, sacrifice, and seclusion, labor and piety, who have left all worldy affection and ambition, for the holy purpose of doing works of charity for mankind; I know that you will appreciate their great sacrifices to serve God, to do good works for all mankind. Without them, who would be the teachers of our youths, the nurses, the consolers and comforters of the sick, old, and needy? May these sacrificing angels always find a warm, appreciative sympathy among us.

The next class of societies are the benevolent societies, their object being, through stated contributions by the members, either

monthly, quarterly, or otherwise to accumulate funds, by means of which, to assist their members, when sick or disabled, to follow their daily avocations, in some instances, in the event of death of either the member or the wife of a member, contribute stated sums, provide for the widow or orphans, and defray the expense of a Christian burial. These societies are of a late date in this country. Perhaps with one or two exceptions, such societies were scarcely known fifty years ago among Catholics. Benevolent societies organized as we now know them, existing by and with the consent and recommendation of the reverend clergy, were but little known as late as 1840. This class of societies became very popular, and rapidly increased in numbers and members, but of late years their growth is not as rapid as it used to be, perhaps owing to other societies since organized, which conduct a kind of a mutual life insurance business under various modes and plans, making so-called life insurance their main object and business, the giving aid and assistance to sick and disabled members being a secondary consideration. These organizations, too, require their members to be practical Catholics. These organizations are recommended by many of the church ordinaries, therefore recognized as Catholic organizations; they have within a few years multiplied rapidly in numbers and membership, and are by many preferred over the old line benevolent societies, aid and assistance in case of sickness being secondary, and less trouble, with larger death benefits. These societies also do much good in banding together the younger element.

The old line benevolent societies require of members to be practical Catholics, and to remain such under penalties and even expulsion. There are two unions of this class of organizations known to me, the German Roman Catholic Central-Verein, or Central Society, and the Irish Catholic Benevolent Union. The two are hand in hand since 1878. There may be others, undoubtedly are, with which I am not acquainted. I will submit a short synopsis of the last annual report of one of these organizations, with which I am somewhat familiar, namely, the German Roman Catholic Central-Verein, to which organization local Catholic benevolent societies from the entire United States, from Maine to California, from Minnesota to Texas, are aggregated, numbering 446 societies. This organizalion has existed thirty-five years, and has prospered. The report of the last year of the aggregated societies shows, that during the last year, ending August 1, $124,343.35 were paid to members during their sickness and disability to follow their daily callings; $140,108.95 were paid for death benefits of members—a total expenditure of $264,452.30, leaving in the treasuries of the different local societies the handsome sum of $740,269.05.

To become a member of a local society, the applicant must be a practical Catholic, and so remain; his name is submitted to the pastor of the parish from whence he comes, whose recommendation is required before the applicant is accepted as a member. He obligates himself to send his children to Catholic schools; he must contribute for the support of these schools, and in all particulars conform to the rules of his parish. Membership entitles to assistance and to ma-

terial aid, when sick or otherwise disabled to follow his usual avocation; in case of death, a Christian burial and a benefit to the widow or the children of deceased members; if there be no widow, to provide for, that the children receive a Christian education, and receive the holy sacraments of the church—in other words, that they may grow up to be practical Catholics in after life. This organization too, has been forced by circumstances to adopt a death benefit, but its plan differs from other organizations in management and requirements; first, the amount of death benefit is limited to $1,000, that being the largest amount which can be obtained or secured; second, no one can become a member unless he be and remain a member of some local society which is aggregated to the Central-Verein. Thus the local societies themselves look to it that the strict adherence and compliance with the rules and the practice to religious duties are kept up. Thus thirdly, these local socities are a safeguard against the intermingling of self-styled Catholics, who are Catholics only by name, invariably an element detrimental to Catholic societies, and often a disturbing element among the Catholic laity. Fourthly, having no agents or solicitors, the expense for management is comparatively small. Fifthly, it has a reserve fund for emergencies. The provision of limiting the amount of death benefit has proved a wholesome one; people are apt to join new societies, and urged by their friends thereto. Men joining societies often do so without giving due consideration to the fact that generally the required contributions are small at the beginning, that only for limited number of years death benefit can be cheaply furnished; invariably all want to secure the highest amount obtainable, regardless of their financial ability or general condition to continue, but little regard is paid to the fact that the required contributions must increase with age.

I deem it a plain duty, devolving upon every person, especially a Catholic, who takes part in organizing societies of this character, to acquaint himself fully with the facts and requirements for stability. They should also provide for possibilities in organizing such societies destined to continue for a long period, a generation or perpetually, to be sure as far as human foresight and prudence can be, that the promises made do not prove fallacious in course of time. Therefore, the amount of benefit should be limited. The limit of the amount ot benefit has proven beneficial in several cases which have come under my own personal observation, and I have after mature deliberation, come to the conclusion that societies based upon mutual contribution plan, by way of assessments, ought to provide only limited death benefits in a manner so that the contributions will not become burdensome on members. All this class of societies ought to have a reserve and also create a fund to aid its sick members, the fact being in almost every case that when the head of a family is thrown upon a sick bed, unable to earn anything, that then the time of need is greatest; when, then, a helping hand is nearing, not in mere cold charity, but the hand of his brother, which helps and comforts him, gives encouragement, invigorates the patient and often does as much to restore his health, as medicine can do.

Life insurance is a business, and must be conducted upon sound business principles and plans, which will stand the test for generations. It is hardly a matter for benevolent societies to undertake on a larger scale. Some objections are urged against benevolent and death-benefit societies, because these confine their aid, assistance, and benefits exclusively to their members and conditional, that if a member fails to pay his allotted contributions for a specific time, he is fined or perhaps expelled. Others refuse to join because amply blessed with worldly goods, considering themselves above want, they can help themselves, in case of sickness or disability, they want no aid and no death benefit. Of course objections can be easily made and excuses found. Let me suggest a remedy right here, to meet the first objection so frequently heard. Let every Catholic join some benevolent society; the contributions of honorary members and those who do not desire to draw benefits be made a special fund, for the purpose to keep up the memberships of others unable to pay their dues; that at once solves the problem, and would establish benevolent societies as lasting institutions among Catholics. Besides the benevolent features, is it not desirable that Catholics of all classes mingle more frequently, than they now do? thus familiarize themselves with the general wants and needs, such as innocent amusements and recreation, manual exercises and entertainments, so much needed for our young people.

We live in an age of organizations. We find organizations and corporations for business, for manufacturing and every imaginable industry in a business sense, the object in numerous cases being, to concentrate capital for large undertakings, but sometimes made use of as a means to avoid personal responsibility. But this is a question for political economists; I leave the subject in their hands. In our time, unless a man is a member of some kind of a society or organization, he is virtually isolated from his fellow-men and dependent upon himself, solitary and alone. Such isolations are un-Catholic; the church is Catholic and established for all classes, and so ought its members be. Therefore the existence of societies has become a necessity.

A Catholic, however, cannot be indifferent as to of what society he becomes a member. In the main a Catholic should not attach himself to any society in which the duties and requirements of members is not clearly defined, he must join no organization or society which requires of him blind obedience, being bound by oath, or word of honor so to do. The organization which I have mentioned has a provision that no member is permitted to join any society not approved by ecclesiastical authorities. I deem it proper, that, the head of a family, above all others, become a member of some benevolent and a death-benefit paying-society, thus provide for those dependent upon him, that in the event he is called away, in early life or later, some assistance is secured for those he leaves behind him that they be provided for in a reasonable manner, which protects them from becoming the recipients of the cold charities of the world. I therefore urge upon this congress to take some steps by which a universal system for benevolent societies be encouraged,

and if possible established. Would it not be feasible for this congress to devise some universal form and plan, upon which Catholic benevolent societies can be organized with uniformity, so that material aid for sick and disabled be one of the requisites, and that all Catholic men be urged to become members throughout the land?

This is the first congress convened by the Catholics in the United States, and aside from the three annual *Katholiken Tags*, held by the Catholics of German parentage or birth, which were all successful and did much good by way of personal acquaintances and interchange of views, as also giving tone and strength to Catholic objects and principles, announcement of truths. No assembly of this kind has ever been heretofore held or attempted in this country, and this first one too, without any regular organization beforehand. Whether other congresses will follow is a question to be decided by the body of Catholics here assembled. It is well for us to look around, to consult, meditate, and deliberate on their necessity, and the matters pertaining to the welfare of our people who by their unity in faith, learning, intelligence, and industry have become so important an element of the American citizen. What a grand spectacle would it be, if here to-day it were possible to present a synopsis of reports of all the good works done throughout this country by Catholic societies of men and women, under the auspices of their bishops and clergy, and of the works in various schools, institutions, as well as societies, and of their prosperity. Such reports and the proceedings of a congress; published and distributed, would not only prove interesting, but be beneficial and encouraging in our onward march in this country of mixed nationality, but all of one faith.

I would not recommend that the representatives of a congress be composed of delegates from societies. I even doubt the propriety of societies holding their annual meetings, conventions, or assemblies at the same time and place when and where the Catholic congress meets; such would take up time and might, in somewhat lessen the interest otherwise taken in the proceedings of congresses.

Organization is a necessary preliminary to all success. Without organization there is no order, without order no unanimity in action. Therefore I would recommend organization of Catholic men in diocesan and parish organizations, as guards of the great boon of "Civil and Religious Liberty," guaranteed by the constitution of our country, that if any man dare to lay hands on that esteemed, I may say sacred, principle, therein contained, he shall be made to understand that he is treading on the dearest rights of every Catholic, as well as American citizen. Such organizations of limited numbers of representative men to be chosen in a manner deemed most feasible. I trust that this congress will take action on this suggestion. Such organizations could hold annual state or diocesan conventions, submit matters for Catholic congresses to act upon. Thus proper subjects for discussion and deliberation could be brought up as need action; thus the congresses would never be subject to undue influence of societies. Such organizations, if properly organized, can do much good. Laymen must take a live interest in matters concerning public welfare; they must be active.

It will not do to let Catholicism be looked upon as simply tolerated in this country, because the head of our creed, not living within the jurisdiction of it as some do charge, which charge in point of fact, is simply absurd, but we must endeavor to prove the falsity thereof by our acts. We ought to have in congress and state legislatures our legitimate number of representative men; the number we have is very small, compared to the proportional number we are entitled to. This should be otherwise. A true Catholic is a true and trusty citizen and patriot, he loves his country next to God; above all, he is devoted to his country and not a blind partisan. It is false to say, that because he is a Catholic, therefore he supports this or that political party. I hold it as a true maxim that the strength of Catholics in the United States rests with them in the maintenance of their independence of political parties.

Organizations, as I have indicated, I deem feasible, and if resorted to will prove beneficial. Without organization we have no means to make our views known. When threatened with obnoxious or unjust legislation, we ought then to be ready to make our views on the pending questions and subjects known. My experience has been that whenever the truth is put forward by an intelligent people in an intelligent and truthful way, the American people will never deny us a hearing, but will maintain the rights of Catholics as untrammelled, as the rights of any other faith or creed

I thank the congress for its kind attention.

MEMORIAL OF THE NATIONAL UNION OF CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN'S SOCIETIES.

READ BY T.C. O'SULLIVAN, OF NEW YORK.

GLANCING back to the threshold of the century that is now closing, we behold the young republic of America, emerging from its baptism of fire, vigorous, hopeful, and free. Clothed in the radiant glow of that freedom, the first representative of our Catholic hierarchy appears, adorned with the laurels of American patriotism, and bearing from the vicar of Christ the commission to proclaim that truth which alone can make us free. Thus associated, thus equipped, the church and the republic start on their journey down the ages. That illustrious central figure of the century, whose memory Catholics fondly cherish, the Most Reverend Archbishop Carroll, wise in his solicitude for the welfare of society, apostolic in his zeal for the propagation of the faith, saw, in the young men about him, the hope of the church and the strength of the state.

Recognizing the necessity of preparing young men for the grand inheritance of Catholic faith and American citizenship, he laid the foundation of Georgetown College, and thus made its work coeval with the American hierarchy. Since then, the increase of Catholic colleges and seminaries has been coextensive with the miraculous growth of Catholicism. Equal in number to the years that have flown since the founding of Georgetown, they stand not only an eloquent testimonial to Catholic enlightenment, but a

splendid tribute to Catholic faith and generosity; and now the educational achievements of the century are about to be crowned by the great Catholic University of Washington.

While bestowing a just meed of praise on what has been accomplished in the domain of superior education, it behooves us to turn our attention to the great body of Catholic young men, and to ask ourselves: "What has been done for them?" It is not necessary here to dwell on the relation between this question and the perpetuity of our social institutions and the welfare of religion.

In a country and in an age like ours, particularly when judged in the light of contemporaneous events in other lands, it is clear that a high order of enlightenment and Christian instruction on matters relating to social and political questions is indispensable to the rank and file of our young men.

Through an organization directed by the church, and reaching out to all classes of young men, we should seek to enlist their sympathies and coöperation, especially in all those matters bearing on their own self-improvement. The materials for such an organization are to be found in the Catholic Young Men's National Union of America. Organized over fifteen years ago, and having for its object the furtherance of practical Catholic unity and the moral and intellectual advancement of young men, its results were such as to win approval of the bishops of the United States at the plenary council of 1884. No stronger approbation could be given than is conveyed in these words from their pastoral letter, "In order to acknowledge the great amount of good that the Catholic Young Men's National Union has already accomplished, to promote the growth of the union, and to stimulate its members to greater efforts in the future, we cordially bless their aims and endeavors and recommend the union to all our Catholic young men." Approbation so emphatic, from that august council, had a stimulating effect upon the union.

Together with the blessings of the bishops upon the union, priests have given to it the assistance of their best efforts; some of them, perhaps, preoccupied by the labors of the sanctuary, have been unable to lend their valuable assistance to its undertakings, but there are, in America, priests who, sympathizing with the aspirations, and sharing the ambitions of the young men, have devoted their lives to the success of the organization. We desire to see its ramifications penetrating into every diocese and every parish of the land. And the chief obstacle to this extension lies in the fact that it is absolutely a society of young men, and that those of maturer years fail to tender them their valuable sympathy and support. There are a few noble exceptions, where Catholics of means and experience, by their generous coöperation with branches of the union, have done much to strengthen the organization in localities; but, as a rule, the members of the union growing into manhood and assuming the responsibilities of that station, leave the younger men to struggle alone for the maintenance of the organization, till the wonder is, not that they have achieved so little, but that they have accomplished so much; as a society of young men, they have earned

the plaudits of Catholic America; submissive to the directions of their ecclesiastical superiors, through their regulations seeking the counsels of their older brethren in the faith, young, self-sacrificing and valiant, wanting in means, but not in courage, they struggle and wait. They behold streams of wealth flowing into the young men's societies of other denominations from wealthy patrons, but patient and faithful still, the Catholic young men labor on, hoping for the day when they will receive the same, if not greater, coöperation and recognition from their more mature and wealthy brethren.

And to this great congress, which represents the brains, the wealth, the devotion, the bone and sinew, the progressive heart of Catholic America, they most respectfully submit the following requests:

First. They ask from you indorsement, sympathy, encouragement for every movement that tends to educate, protect, unite, and ground more thoroughly in their faith, our Catholic young men.

Second. They ask your active interest in your several localities for the establishment of young men's societies and for their banding together in diocesan and national unions.

Third. They ask especially the members of this congress who represent the Catholic press to lend their far-reaching influence towards clearly establishing throughout the length and breadth of the land these two facts, viz., that the success of the young men's societies means the greatest possible prosperity for the Catholic Church in the future; and that this success can never be obtained in its fullest measure, until the movement has the active coöperation of those who possess mature minds, generous hearts; and plentiful store.

Let these things be done, and great as the American Catholic Church is to-day, that greatness will be only as the light of morn to the splendor of the sun, when compared with the grandeur in our years to come.

MR. EDWARD MCGANNON, of Columbus, O.: "I have a paper here which I wish to read."

YOUNG MEN'S CATHOLIC SOCIETIES.

ADDRESS BY MR. E. MCGANNON, OF COLUMBUS, O.

There is no subject that can engage the attention of the Catholic people of this country, of as much, or more importance than the formation and success of societies for the spiritual, mental, and social improvement, particularly of the young men. That immense efforts have been, and are being made in this direction, we are well aware; but owing to special causes, many of the societies at present established do not have the influence for good that their founders desire and labor earnestly for. A consideration by this congress, of the kind of societies needed, and the necessary means to make them successful, will, I hope, be of great advantage and benefit in the future.

The society or institution needed is one that will include all classes of young men in its benefits and assist them to elevate them-

selves by honest effort in the difierent professions and stations of life they occupy. In every city of the Union, we have to deal with different classes of young men, many of whom have the most intense desire for culture and knowledge. These classes are represented by the young man who has received a liberal, possibly a collegiate, education, by the young man whose education and intellectual tastes are on a lower plane, and by the young man who has been compelled to begin the battle for life's necessaries before he had received more than the scantiest foundation of intellectual acquirements. These three classes are supplemented by yet another, viz., the young men of each, who without any definite idea of advancement, spend their evenings in the pursuit of so-called pleasure and enjoyment.

To meet the wants of all these classes is absolutely necessary, if we hope to effect any lasting or real good. The society needed should possess the means to satisfy each in their particular bent and incite them to labor for their advancement. It should possess all the qualifications of a young business man's university, where every mind would find development and the assistance to progress it may require. For the educated young man it should have the library and reading room, debating class and reading circle. For the young man of medium education, it should have the educational classes suited to his wants, and for the young man who may be said to have left off just where his real secular education would have begun, it should have every requisite to furnish him the knowledge which his hard lot in life denied, and, for the young man who seeks after pleasure and enjoyment, it should have the means to furnish them, free from vice and evil surroundings.

Have we many such societies? And if not, whose fault is it? How is it that the young men's societies do not prosper as they ought to do? Is it the young men's fault? Most certainly not. It is our fault. We, the fathers of the young men, are to blame, because we fail to give them the assistance in the formation and management of their societies that we ought to give, and that they have the right to expect. We never tire of telling them "They ought to do something for their improvement," but do we help them? Unfortunately we do not. If under the advice of friends, some of our young people attempt to give an entertainment, it is very probable they will have to depend upon our separated brethren for their largest support, and the very people whom it was intended to please and benefit, and who ought to have honored the occasion with their presence, ay! even if they had to go upon their knees, are conspicuous only by their absence. Can we expect progress from our children, with such indifference on our part? If any of us had a son who intended to adopt a farmer's life, or who was ordered to do so for the benefit of his health, would we say to him, "Son, go, be a farmer," and consider we had done all our duty? I think not. Would we not do our utmost to assist him to procure a good farm, and when one was found to satisfy our requirements as to what would constitute a good paying investment, would we not help him to buy the implements, and other things needed to make the attempt successful? Our means and credit would, and should

be used in his behalf, and until we saw he was able to manage it successfully himself, our time, experience, and ability would be ever at his service. But in the management of this other farm, where the soul and mind require the health-giving properties of useful knowledge, we leave them to their own devices, unaided by means, money, or advice. This is unbusiness like, and most unreasonable.

It has been justly stated that our young men have little unity or cohesiveness. How could they have them? Of different vocations of life and such varied mental attainments, the only thing they possess in common is their faith; and it is our duty to furnish the means to effect this unity, without which no real progress can ever be attained.

For this purpose, we must provide them with a building especially adapted to their wants, containing a good library and reading room, gymnasium and billiard room, a lecture hall, comfortable parlors and class rooms, where education in the necessary branches, and, if the young men desire, in the higher branches could be obtained at a nominal cost. You will ask, "Can such a thing be done? And if so, how much will it cost?" I will answer, "It can be done," and if you will assist in the management, in ten or fifteen years at most, every penny of the investment will be returned to the investors in actual dollars and cents, and our young men will have an institution that they and all of us will be proud of, worth at least fifty per cent more than its actual cost, and of untold value to our people for the benefits that had been received, and that would continue to be received, through its influence and instrumentality for ages to come.

For the purpose of explanation, I will suppose that such an institution was desired in this city of Baltimore. To insure success and general assistance in the work, it should be managed by a board of directors, of which the cardinal archbishop and his successors in office should be president, and have the appointing power. The directorship to consist of the rector and two laymen from every parish in the city, the rector to be a member by virtue of his sacred office, the lay directors to be appointed for two or three years, as might be decided upon. If a larger board was deemed necessary at the commencement of the work, it could be obtained by appointing directors at large, or three laymen from every parish. It is unnecessary for me to call your attention to the immense influence such a board would possess, and with what unanimity and good will the confidence and support of the entire people would be given to it. In order to get the means to erect and equip the building, they could issue share certificates of $10 each, secured upon the building, and payable at their option. I feel confident with such a board and such prospects for the success of this glorious work, that every Catholic man and woman in the city would purchase these shares according to their means, and that the necessary sum to complete the building would be obtained as if by magic. There should be committees appointed to direct the different branches; such as finance, site, plans, building, educational classes, library, gymnasium, Catholic interests, constitution and by-laws, and an execu-

tive committee, which last should consist of the chairmen of all the committees. Of course it would be impossible for His Eminence to attend to the minute details of all the work, but with such committees and learned, able priests on the library, educational, and Catholic interest committees, his labors would be much relieved. The executive committee should select a general secretary who would attend to the clerical work of the institution, and with competent instructors for each department, success would be assured from the very first day of its opening.

On the completion of the building there should be ready for pupils, established classes in the following branches: Penmanship, grammar, arithmetic, bookkeeping, stenography, and type-writing, drawing and vocal music, also the study of the German and Spanish languages, for which the charges should be ten cents a week. Special studies could be provided for when a sufficient number of young men would sign an application which would be presented to the directors for their establishment, and for which the charges might be twenty cents per week, the directors in every case engaging a competent teacher for every class and study. Each class and society should have the privilege of electing their own president, secretary, treasurer, or other officers, whom the directors would hold responsible for the proper government of their members and prompt payment of dues. The presidents of all the societies and classes should form a young men's committee, whose duty it would be to arrange for the weekly social entertainments, also to provide young men to serve as a reception committee every evening at the rooms to meet, welcome, and introduce members and visitors. They would also have the arrangement of the yearly exhibition of the work of the different societies and classes, thereby welding the entire membership into a compact body of workers, and at the same time leave each class and society its own individuality and perfect freedom in the full exercise and control of its own affairs.

For the social entertainments the parlors of the building should be at their service when needed, free of charge, and for the yearly exhibitions, they should be furnished on the same terms with a room, or rooms, capable of accomodating their most extensive and ambitious efforts. By such arrangement of forces, the young men would have all their time for work and progress, and be relieved of the great responsibility of executive work, which we all know would be more successfully performed by older and more experienced men. It would also furnish a school where the young could learn from the ripe experience of able men the care and study needed to insure success in any and every undertaking.

The membership of the institution should consist of active, honorary, library and non-Catholic members. The active members would be respectable Catholic gentlemen of sixteen years and over, who, possessing membership in the library and reading room, would be entitled to all the privileges of the institution on payment of the dues attached to each, which might be as follows: Library and reading room, $4.00 per year; gymnasium, $5.00 per year; estab-

lished classes, ten cents per week, and special classes, twenty cents per week.

The honorary members would be those who for special reasons might be elected by the board of directors, and who would be entitled to all the privileges usually accorded to such members. The library members would be Catholic ladies, and boys under sixteen years of age, who upon payment of $2.00 per year would be entitled to the use of the library and reading room on week days between the hours of eight o'clock A. M., and six o'clock P. M.

Non-Catholic members would be respectable non-Catholic gentlemen of sixteen years and over, who upon presentation of a recommendation from their pastor, or other well known citizen of the city, and the payment of active membership dues, would be entitled to all the privileges of the institution, but would be debarred from holding any office.

Such an institution would be a centre of Catholic thought and progress, and a source of just and honest pride to every Catholic in the country. I trust that this year, made memorable in the history of the country by this, the first meeting of an American Catholic congress, will see the beginning of many such societies in every state in the Union.

Hon. Morgan J. O'Brien, of New York, said: *Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Congress:* Before presenting the report of the committee on resolutions it is proper that I should state, that in view of the very short time which has been allotted to our work, a number of subjects that necessarily ought to have been considered were not discussed by us. The few subjects that have been included in the report necessitate that I should at the outset ask for the committee your considerate indulgence. We have done within the limited time all we could do. We have touched the more general subjects as we regarded them, and we trust that in any discussion which may take place in reference to the work of the committee you will take the situation into account, and give us the same considerate indulgence that has been given to all the other committees and officers of this convention. (Applause.) The report of the committee on resolutions is as follows:

RESOLUTIONS.

THE meeting of the first congress of Catholic laymen in the United States, to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the American hierarchy, is an event of the greatest importance to our church and country. It would seem eminently proper that we, the laymen of the church, should meet and renew our allegiance to the doctrines we profess; that we should show to our fellow countrymen the true relations that exist between the church that we obey and love, and the government of our choice;

that we should proclaim that unity of sentiment upon all subjects presented to us, which has ever been the source of Catholic strength, and that in a spirit of perfect charity towards every denomination, we should freely exchange our views in relation to all matters which affect us as members of the Catholic Church.

In the first place, then, we rejoice at the marvellous development of our country, and regard with just pride the part taken by Catholics in such development. In the words of the pastoral issued by the archbishops and bishops of the United States, assembled in the third plenary council of Baltimore: "We claim to be acquainted both with the laws, institutions, and spirit of the Catholic Church, and with the laws, institutions, and spirit of our country. and we emphatically declare that there is no antagonism between them."

We repudiate with equal earnestness the assertion that we need to lay aside any of our devotedness to our church to be true Americans; the insinuation that we need to abate any of our love for our country's principles and institutions to be faithful Catholics.

We believe that our country's heroes were the instruments of the God of Nations in establishing this home of freedom; to both the Almighty and to his instruments in the work we look with grateful reverence, and to maintain the inheritance of freedom which they have left us, should it ever—which God forbid—be imperilled, our Catholic citizens will be bound to stand forward as one man, ready to pledge anew their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

We cannot, however, shut our eyes to the many dangers that threaten the destruction of that social fabric upon which depend our peace, our liberty, and our free institutions. Although our wealth has increased and prosperity abounds, our cities have multiplied and our states increased, we find, under the shadow of this system, incipient pauperism, discontented men, women, and children, without the benefits of education, without the advantages of religion, deprived of any share in that abundance of participation in those blessings which, through our free institutions, God Almighty designed for the people of our land.

As to the heed to be paid to the rights of the individual, we favor those means, measures, and systems by which these are to be secured.

We recognize next in importance to religion itself education as one of the chief factors in forming the character of the individual, the virtue of the citizen, and promoting the advance of a true civilization. Therefore, we are committed to a sound, popular education, which demands not only physical and intellectual, but also the moral and religious training of our youth.

As in the state schools, no provision is made for teaching religion, we must continue to support our own schools, multiply and perfect colleges and universities already established and others, so that the benefits of a Christian education may be brought within the reach of every Catholic child in these United States.

We also recognize among the three great educational agencies, besides the church and school, the Christian home. "The root of the commonwealth is in the homes of the people." Whatever im-

perils its permanency, security, and peace, is a blow aimed, not only at individual rights, but is an attempt to subvert civil society and Christian civilization.

Therefore, we denounce the existence and development of Mormonism, and the tendency to multiply causes of divorce *a vinculo*, as plague spots on our civilization, a discredit to our government, a degradation of the female sex, and a standing menace to the sanctity of the marriage bond.

We likewise hold that it is not sufficient for individual Catholics to shun bad or dangerous societies, but they ought to take part in good and useful ones. The importance of Catholic societies, the necessity of union and concert of action to accomplish aught, are manifest. These societies should be organized on a religious, and not on a race or national basis. We must always remember that the Catholic Church knows no north or south, no east or west, no race, no color. National societies, as such, have no place in the church in this country ; but, like this congress itself, they should be Catholic and American.

We commend the plan and form of the St. Vincent de Paul Society as a typical Catholic society. It is impossible to enumerate all the societies whose labors have done so much in the past to succor the poor and alleviate human misery ; and it must, therefore, be left to individual action, to select the field in which each shall aid in religious and charitable work.

As our young men, however, are the hope of the future, we especially commend their societies to the support and encouragement of Catholics. As these were commended in a special manner by the plenary council, we recommend the establishment of these societies throughout the land, and urge upon the laity the importance of supporting them by every means within their power.

We recommend the extension of societies designed to assist the widows and children of deceased members; societies for the relief of the poor and distressed, not forgetting measures tending to improve the condition of inmates of our penal institutions.

Another danger which menaces our republic is the constant conflict between capital and labor. We, therefore, at all times must view with feelings of regret and alarm any antagonism existing between them, because thereby society itself is imperilled.

With the church, we condemn nihilism, socialism, and communism, and we equally condemn the heartless greed of capital. The remedy must be sought in the mediation of the church, through her action on the individual conscience, and thereby on society, teaching each its respective duties, as well as rights; and in such civil enactments as have been rendered necessary by these altered conditions. As stated by his eminence, Cardinal Gibbons: "Labor has its sacred rights, as well as its dignity. Paramount among the rights of the laboring classes is their privilege to organize or to form themselves into societies for their mutual protection and benefit. In honoring and upholding labor, the nation is strengthening its own hands, as well as paying a tribute to worth; for a contented and happy working class are the best safeguard of the republic."

We disapprove of the employment of very young minors, whether male or female, in factories, as tending to dwarf and retard the true development of the wage earners of the future.

We pledge ourselves to coöperate with the clergy in discussing and in solving those great economic and social questions which affect the interests and well-being of the church, the country, and society at large.

We respectfully protest against any change in the policy of the government in the matter of the education of the Indians, by which they will be deprived of Christian teaching.

The amelioration and promotion of the physical and moral culture of the negro race is a subject of the utmost concern, and we pledge ourselves to assist our clergy in all ways tending to effect any improvement in their condition.

We are in favor of Catholics taking greater part than they have hitherto taken in general philanthropic and reformatory movements. The obligation to help the needy, and to instruct the ignorant, is not limited to the needy and ignorant of our own communion; but we are concerned, both as Catholics and as Americans, in the reformation of all the criminals and the support of all the poor in the country. By mingling more in such works of natural virtue, as our non-Catholic citizens are engaged in, and taking our proper share in the management of prisons and hospitals, we might exert a Catholic influence outside of our own body, make ourselves better known, and infuse into those good works something of supernatural charity, at the same time that we are solacing the unfortunate and reforming the erring; and we should be able to insist on Catholic inmates being freely ministered to by their own clergy. We must assert and secure the right of conscience of Catholics in all institutions under public control.

There are many Christian issues in which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics, and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday. To effect this we must set our faces sternly against the sale of intoxicating beverages on Sunday. The corrupting influence of saloons on politics, the crime and pauperism resulting from excessive drinking, require legislative restriction which we can aid in procuring by joining our influence with that of the other enemies of intemperance. Let us resolve that drunkenness shall be made odious, and give practical encouragement and support to Catholic temperance societies. We favor the passage and enforcement of laws rigidly closing saloons on Sunday, and forbidding the sale of liquors to minors and intoxicated persons.

Efforts should be made to promote Catholic reading. It is our duty to support liberally good Catholic journals and books, and acquaint ourselves with Catholic doctrine and opinion on the important questions constantly coming to the front and demanding right answers and just, practical solutions. There are comparatively few

Catholics who cannot afford the cost of a Catholic journal, or do not spend much more for a story-paper or novel than the price of one. We not only recommend Catholics to subscribe more generally for Catholic periodicals, quarterly, monthly, or weekly, but look with eagerness for the establishment of daily Catholic newspapers in our large cities and a Catholic associated press agency. If our Catholic literature is not equal to the standard by which we measure it, this is due, at least in part, to the slight encouragement now given to Catholic writers of the better type. If the best Catholic books were extensively purchased and read, more would be written which we should be proud of. We recommend, therefore, the work of Catholic circulating libraries and reading circles, and also efforts to have the best Catholic books and periodicals introduced into public libraries. But we do not call all books Catholic that are written by Catholics, nor a journal which is Catholic on one page and infidel or immoral on another.

As fast as practicable we hope for the introduction of proper church music in all our churches where other music is now heard. The music should help devotion at the divine service, and not be such as tends to divert the mind from heavenly thoughts. Efforts should be made to have the congregation join in the singing—a Catholic custom formerly, but practised only in a few churches nowadays.

We cannot conclude without recording our solemn conviction that the absolute freedom of the Holy See is equally indispensable to the peace of the church and the welfare of mankind.

We demand in the name of humanity and justice, that this freedom be scrupulously respected by all secular governments.

We protest against the assumption by any such government of a right to affect the interests or control the action of our Holy Father by any form of legislation or other public act to which his full approbation has not been previously given, and we pledge to Leo XIII., the worthy pontiff to whose hands Almighty God has committed the helm of Peter's bark amid the tempests of this stormy age, the loyal sympathy and unstinted aid of all his spiritual children in vindicating that perfect liberty which he justly claims as his sacred and inalienable right.

The report of the committee on resolutions was unanimously adopted.

CATHOLIC AMERICAN LITERATURE.

EIGHTH REGULAR PAPER, BY CONDÉ B. PALLEN, PH.D., OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

We hear it constantly asserted that Catholics in this country have achieved but an insignificent success in the field of literature. The truth of this charge, if the matter may be regarded in that light, we cannot entirely deny; but if the proper limitations be drawn around the scope of the assertion, it will be found to be true only in a comparative sense. The absolute declaration that American Catholic literature has been a failure rests upon the assumption

that it has had every opportunity of becoming a success. It needs, however, but a moment's reflection upon the conditions which have encompassed its development, to show how groundless is the presumption.

It is an evident law that the culture of letters only flourishes under influences not to be found in every stage of social existence; a soil is required peculiar to the nature of the plant, a soil fallow with the settled usages of generations, mellow with the associations of the past, and rich with aspirations for the future. When we glance over our national history of the past 100 years we fail to find these conditions fulfilled. We have been a growing nation, an adolescent people, with Titanic vigor, it is true, yet young, and in the almost raw process of formation. We have been pioneers clearing the path for a civilization unequalled in the annals of the world, the constructors of an empire's foundations, the vastness of which portends the colossal proportions of that temple of liberty whose roof-tree yet looms in the distant future. We have builded well and nobly, and with the grace of a propitious Providence, we trust, for all time. We have carried civilization a vast distance beyond the stage in which we found it, and have elaborated a system of government under which the inalienable liberty of the individual, the key note of true civilization, finds its surest guaranty and its widest scope. But the work of fashioning and shaping to this great end has kept our hands and our brains busy with the labor of construction. We have had to clear the forest, prepare the soil, build up innumerable cities, construct mighty systems of railroads, develop the mine, explore and navigate the largest water courses in the world, bridge countless rivers, regulate the intricacies of an immense internal commerce, and above all solve the greatest problem which ever taxed the genius of a people, the problem of self-government. Our progress has never for an instant ceased; our toil has been unremitting, and in one short century has advanced with colossal stride from the Atlantic seaboard across 5,000 miles of continent to the distant shores of the Pacific. Little time, short leisure, and few opportunities in this unprecedented march of progress have been granted to us to cultivate the field of letters, and if our national literature lack that mature fulness which is to be found amongst the peoples of the Old World, our wonder should rather be that we have done so well than have accomplished what by comparison seems so little.

If our national literature has been so straitened in its growth by the absence of those favoring conditions which are so essential to its highest development, with peculiar and intense emphasis may the same standard of excellence be applied to Catholic American literature. Here not only have these general and adverse circumstances prevailed, but peculiar and unique influences have been constantly brought to bear against its progress. Our Catholic population, excepting within the past twenty years, has borne but an insignificant proportion in the country's census; and those composing it for the main part have been the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, the sons of labor with hardened hands and sweating brow,

whose humble lot has known little of this world's comforts. Theirs has been the portion of manual toilers with little opportunity to read, and much less to stimulate or contribute to the development of literature. With pick and shovel, hod and trowel, hammer and anvil, or in positions of servitude, the majority of American Catholics have worked out their mission in the nation's history, until with the blessings of a free government we find them in the present generation by force of industry, perseverance, and ability taking their places with credit and honor in every honorable and illustrious pursuit. Not only, however, has Catholic literature had to contend against the want of an audience, the lack of a public demand to stimulate and develop it, but it has had to face the almost overwhelming prejudice of an alien faith. On the one hand the Catholic writer has found a very limited hearing among his own, and on the other an almost flat refusal to listen to what he might have to say by the majority of his countrymen. To be Catholic was to be unheeded; those of his own faith had no ears to hear, and those of another had obstinately closed theirs to his utterances. Under these untoward conditions what hope could there be for the advance of Catholic literature? Is it strange that its growth has not been as vigorous as we would wish, that it has not burgeoned to the maturity for which we yet hope? Yet in spite of the nipping frost of neglect, the chilling indifference of the public, we have had a literature, which burst into blossom through the inherent virtue of the seed from which it sprang rather than from the fostering care of any external demand.

To mention the illustrious name of Orestes A. Brownson is to place before your minds that which is foremost and most characteristic in Catholic American literature. A convert and a typical American, his life was a practical exemplification of the principles he so dearly cherished and so strenuously advocated. His influence over the Catholic mind of this country has been the widest, and his impress the deepest of any pen wielded in the Catholic cause. In polemical writing he has had no equal in all American literature. Endowed with a colossal intellect, imbued with a lion-like courage, gifted with a masterful power of expression and a penetrating keenness of insight, he waged the battle of truth long and vigorously, nobly and successfully. His was no easy path to the light of truth; he literally hewed his way through the opposing barriers of a thousand difficulties, which would have overwhelmed a lesser man in utter despair. His career stands out a monumental example of the Catholic American, a brilliant light and a heroic guide to his fellow countrymen.

Associated early with Orestes A. Brownson is the name of one who but lately passed from our midst to the contemplation of those eternal truths after which he had here so ardently aspired. Many of the traits which so conspicuously shone in the Agamemnon of our Catholic literature, likewise characterized the late Rev. Isaac T. Hecker. He possessed the same thorough honesty, the same ardent earnestness, the same fervent faith, and the same deep and genuine love of our liberty-giving institutions. The intensity of his

love of country was second only to the love of his holy faith. No man of our age has displayed a more comprehensive grasp of its controlling spirit; no one has shown a deeper insight into the principles which are shaping the history of the century. His sympathies were as wide as his insight deep, and his life was a consecration to the service of his church and his fellow-men. Although his pen may not be called prolific, his words are charged with an intensity of thought and a breadth of suggestion that amply make up for the lack of volumes. No Catholic writer has so luminously portrayed the beautiful harmony which exists between the divine truth of Catholicity and the spirit of our republican institutions. He has vindicated the title of Catholics to American citizenship in such a way as not only to merit the gratitude of his fellow-Catholics, but to win the honest applause of his fellow-countrymen.

Others there are whose work in the field of Catholic literature entitles them to more than a passing tribute. But as a retrospect of the past is practically outside of the scope of this paper, and the broad prospect of the future stretches invitingly before us, want of both time and space forces us to the consideration of what Catholic literature is to be, however reluctantly we may turn away from such renowned names as John England, Martin John Spalding and others of lesser note, but none the less "names not writ in water." The past has inscribed its own record, and the signet of time is upon it. He who opens its pages may read for himself its unalterable and often profitable lesson. Though there are not many Catholic names upon them illustrious in American literature, those that do stand there have left an impress, of which, when we look back upon the difficulties in the way of their work, we may be justly proud, and from which we may catch the breath of inspiration for the future.

That the face of the earth has been wonderfully changed in the past fifty years is no longer a novelty to us; it has become one of the commonplaces of life. Not only, however, has there been a marvellous development in the material conditions of the civilized world, but in its intellectual aspect there has taken place what may be not improperly called a revolution. This is an age of the diffusion of thought. I do not mean that the masses of the people think for themselves, but that the speculations of thinkers through the unlimited convenience of the printing press, reach the public mind in one shape or another, and there leave an indelible impress for good or for evil. It is in this sense that thought has become diffusive, and has wrought a vast change in the mental attitude of the world. Literature has become popularized and the masses now drink of its fountains, pure or foul. This is also an age of theory; an age bold in its speculations upon all things sacred and profane. It is an age of rationalism, that is, an age in which human reason summons before the bar of its judgment not only the doings of men, but the revelation of God, although in no age have the fundamental principles of reason been so constantly outraged. It is an age of intellectual conflict; theory clashes with theory; it is therefore an age of mental confusion, of doubt, of scepticism, of nihilism, of agnosticism. It is an age which has lost an ideal, and endeavors to

substitute its many idols in the place of its lost hope. But it is not only amongst those who think and write that this condition holds; it has found its way to the public at large, where it can be and is put into practical effects. It is emphatically an age of transition; an age which is witnessing the awakening of human intelligence from a lethargy cast on it by the doctrines of a system that for three centuries has lain like an incubus upon the human mind. Men are rebelling against the principles laid down by the religious revolution of the sixteenth century; they are practically repudiating the doctrine of "man's total depravity" and the "irresponsibility of the human will." Human rights are asserting themselves against a false principle, which has held them in bondage for 300 years. But human reason thus seeking its liberty in throwing off the yoke imposed upon it by the so-called reformers, has become intoxicated with its own freedom. Unwonted light has blinded its eyes, and in its fierce attack upon that distortion of Christian truth, it has unfortunately failed to see that its enemy is not Christianity, but its counterfeit. As a consequence we are witnessing a fierce onslaught upon divine revelation in the name of reason and science. To the non-Catholic mind Protestantism is Christianity, and with the former's unreasonableness is supposed to fall the entire fabric of the Christian dispensation. Having rejected a divine revelation under the impulse of this delusion human reason is thrown violently back upon its own insufficiency, and endeavors to construct out of its limitations a religious system to meet the wants of human nature. As a result we see the various conflicting *isms* into which it has split.

What is the position of the Catholic-American writer in this conflict, and what are his resources? As the difficulty which confronts him lies primarily in the regions of human reason, it is necessary for him to be familiar with the science of the rational faculty. The confusion of the modern intellect results, not from a vitiated condition of the reason, but from its perversion. It is not that the faculty is diseased, but its uses are not known. It has become dizzy with the exhilaration of its new-found freedom. Exalted by some to the throne of deity, debased by some to the level of the brutes, it alternately exults and despairs. It claims complete emancipation, yet in the same breath declares its utter subjection to matter; withal it poses as the supreme arbiter of all things, beyond whose dicta there is no further tribunal of appeal. It therefore becomes the duty of the Catholic writer to point out the true functions of reason, to reëstablish it in its legitimate sphere of action; to show how far it reaches and where it stops; to combat its pretensions and to vindicate its dignity; to demonstrate its infallibility in its proper field, and yet prove its weakness in matters where it often arrogates most assurance. He will have to make clear that Catholicity in no way compromises reason, and at the same time show that reason alone is not an all-sufficient guide to man. As reason itself proclaims, there can be no antagonism between the light of reason which comes from God, and the light of faith which equally comes from the same divine source. Faith supplements knowledge and strengthens the

natural faculty. The light of revelation illumes the human reason and even assists it in its search after truths within its natural compass.

To accomplish this work the Catholic writer needs to master the science of reason. Elaborated to an overflowing fulness, and with a marvellous delicacy of precision, this sublimest of all sciences he will find ready to his hand in the giant labors of St. Thomas of Aquin, to whose works the present great pontiff, with a foresight begot of his exalted office, has called the attention of the Catholic world, as the storehouse of those invincible principles with which the enemies of the church are to be met and overcome. To scholastic philosophy human reason must return for its own vindication. When the religious revolutionists of the sixteenth century abandoned the teachings of the church, they also turned their backs upon that system of philosophy which Christian thinkers had constructed out of the materials bequeathed to them by the Greek philosophers. Among no other people of the earth had the science of human reason been so highly and completely developed as among the Greeks. Unassisted by the light of the supernatural, reason in Plato and Aristotle winged its highest flight and became in the true sense of the word the "Queen of Sciences." As Christianity is but the supernatural supplement of nature, a divinely revealed light from the same source whence burns the torch of human reason, a system of divine grace from above designed to correspond with man's natural aspiration from below, so in keeping with its divine character, Christianity seized upon those rational principles which Aristotle had so masterfully systematized, purged them of the accidental errors of heathenism, illumed them with its gracious truth, infused into them its undying vitality, and made them preëminently its own. It was from this most perfect system of rational science that the nations turned their faces when they embraced the false principles fathered by Luther and Calvin. In the place of human freedom they substituted the slave-will of the one and the predetermined will of the other; in the place of man's natural rights they put the hideous doctrine of his total depravity. Reason was dethroned and human nature debased. That accord between nature and grace, between reason and faith, which scholasticism had so lucidly and victoriously established, was rent asunder at one fell stroke, and a false Christianity imposed upon the peoples, who then broke from the authority of the church. The harmonious continuity with the past was severed; all true development in the line of philosophy was arrested, and reason abandoned to the confusion of contradictory theories. As a consequence philosophy in Germany has rushed into the empty void of transcendentalism, in France it has broken asunder on the wheels of scepticism, and in England it has mired in the slough of materialism. To regain the lost path reason must return to scholasticism, not indeed to the formal methods of scholastic argumentation, but to those substantial principles which it has laid down as the basis of truth.

As Americans, Catholic writers have a fruitful opportunity in this country to bring about such a reconcilement. The cardinal

principle of our system of government, the pivot upon which its entire machinery turns, is contained in the natural truth that all men have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is the declaration of human reason affirming the essential freedom of the rational creature. This declaration rests upon the necessary assumption that man is good, not totally depraved; that he is free, not the predestined puppet of an implacable will. It is on these lines that our national institutions have developed; it is on these lines that our greatness as a people has been achieved, and it is only on these lines that we may hope to shape the destinies of the world to the political emancipation of all mankind. When the Declaration of Independence was penned, the death knell of Calvinism was sounded, and human reason awoke in a new land to the consciousness of its inalienable rights. It was but a step in logic from this declaration to that other cardinal principle of religious toleration, whereby all creeds were cut off from state support and given a fair field to develop according to their own inherent virtues. Catholicity was then but a slender plant in this country, but it had taken no mean part in the achievement of our independence; to this Washington's farewell address bears noble testimony. The success of Catholicity in America in the last century the visible presence of this congress attests more than words. Would the Catholic Church of these United States have attained its present great proportions had it been inimical to our republican institutions? Unchanged and unshaken, as when 100 years ago this august see was established, it now numbers more American citizens within its fold than any single denomination in the country. Can the sects to-day be called the same as Protestantism presented itself in America at the close of the revolutionary war? Not even slowly, but rapidly, has the process of disintegration been going on under the pressure of those fundamental principles contained in the Declaration of Independence. "This is not to be wondered at," says Father Hecker, "when you consider that every time a freeman goes to the polls and deposits his vote in the ballot box he virtually condemns the dogmas of Protestantism and practically repudiates the Reformation. The persistent action of the ballot box outweighed the persuasive force of the Puritan pulpit." To trust a government to the suffrages of the people is to place faith in the essential goodness of human nature, to rely upon human intelligence, and to proclaim man's inherent freedom.

What other basis does Catholicity postulate? Given the free, rational creature and the unrestricted use of that freedom, what other ground does the supernatural light of faith require? Is not the light of right reason God-given to man in the very constitution of his nature, and is not the light of faith God-given to man in the dispensation of the divine word? Conflict here there cannot be, harmony there must be. Amongst a people whose political and social life is rooted in these principles of right reason Catholicity becomes not only consonant, but the fitting supplement of their natural aspirations. Before another century has ushered in our second centennial the American people will be either Catholic or agnostic.

But agnostic they can never become as long as they remain true to their cardinal principles, for the doctrine of nescience is the death of right reason.

It is the province of future Catholic literature in America to cultivate this field; to demonstrate that not only there is not, but cannot be, any conflict between republican institutions and Catholic doctrine; that a nation whose civil policy is based upon the dicta of right reason is the natural basis of Catholicity, and that the widest liberty of the individual and the surest safeguard of his happiness lies in his American citizenship and the infallible guidance of the Catholic Church. This position cannot be too firmly taken; its reiteration cannot be too frequent; it cannot be proclaimed too boldly; it is a truth that requires no trimming; it is a fact whose evidence cannot be made too palpable. Among our non-Catholic fellow-citizens it is not recognized because it is not known. While not Protestant in the true meaning of the word, they have unfortunately inherited from Protestantism its natural prejudice against Catholicity; they condemn the church only because they do not know it. To carry this light to the mind of the American people at large is one of the great missions of Catholic American literature.

It is not, however, merely in the formal presentation of this great subject to non-Catholics that the best results may be hoped for. There is no domain of literature where the Catholic writer may not work to the same end, and no more fruitful field offers itself to him than history. The Comte de Maistre declared that history, as written for the past three centuries, has been a vast conspiracy against truth. While we may not be prepared to admit the full sweep of this unconditioned assertion, we are forced to recognize not a little truth in it, for English writers have doled out but scant justice to the church in matters historical. The false notions of her history which prevail amongst non-Catholics but too plainly witness to the violation of historical truth in her case. In justification of their separation from the church in the sixteenth century the so-called reformers were forced to depict the church in the worst possible light. Unless she were the corrupt and faithless organization which they proclaimed her to be, the ground upon which they stood was as insecure as the quicksands of the desert. With this purpose in view they have written that history. Like her divine Model she has been held up to the ignorant contumely of the crowd. Now that the motive of thus distorting truth has no longer a reason, we may hope for a more impartial attitude on the part of those not within her pale. It devolves upon the Catholic writer to present that history in the highest interests of truth; to trace the divine action, through the church, upon human society, and with philosophic judgment sift the chaff from the grain. History is not a mere panorama of events; to depict the shifting scenes of human life only in the letter is of little profit; the bare narration of facts gives us only the framework, the lifeless skeleton of man's past existence. It is in the spirit of the times, in which human affairs find their development, that the historian discovers their real

meaning. It is his duty, and his art, to distinguish between the complex movements out of which human events grow, to discover the nexus between effects and their proper causes, and to discriminate between the merely material side of an epoch and its formal principle. Unless he do this his picture will have neither color nor perspective; it will be a mere delineation of anatomy, a mechanical description of a corpse. Above all, his judgment of any particular epoch will have little value if he does not comprehend it in its relations to all other epochs of man's career. Nowhere is the application of these principles so necessary as in the history of the Catholic Church. In her the human element and the divine principle which animates her are not one and the same; and yet it is only as a visibly organized body living and breathing amidst the elements of space and time that she can be seen. On her purely human side she is in a state of ceaseless change; on her divine, she is eternally immutable. As the soul is to the human frame, so is her divinity the informing principle of a material body, that is being perpetually renewed. She has seen many varying phases of human existence. Under her eyes whole races and nations have sprung up and passed away on the shifting currents of time. The lights and shadows of their fleeting existence have been cast upon her eternal form as she abided changelessly amidst their vicissitudes. Her history is theirs, and at the same time not theirs, and unless that distinction between her and them, and yet that identity between her and them, be kept in view, her history cannot be read aright.

When the church entered upon her divine mission she found the individual under the Roman jurisdiction without a recognized title to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The state was supreme master and the subject abject slave. Upon this slave she placed her divine impress and he became of eternal value, the equal of imperial Cæsar himself. Under the breath of this divine inspiration Roman institutions crumbled away and the old social fabric melted into thin air. After Rome had sunk into the void of the past, the barbaric blood of the untamed north surged down in stormy fury against the rock of Peter. For centuries the barbarian hordes outside of the limits of the Roman empire had known no law; the caprice of license had been the dominant force of their souls. The restraint of law they would not brook, and the sweet fruits of liberty, slaves of their passions as they were, they had never tasted. If Rome had represented the despotism of law, barbarism expressed the tyranny of license. Into the fiery souls of these restless nomads the church breathed her inspiring vigor, bent their stubborn pride to the virtue of obedience, subdued their wild passions to the enobling constraint of her divine law, and made them free men, in so far as the imperfect conditions of the times suffered the action of the divine principle.

It is in this that we may find the keynote to the temporal mission of the church, and it is only in this light that the history of the Dark Ages has any meaning. Herein was the period which saw the momentous struggle between divine law and brute license, and our Christian civilization is the present witness to the happy issue.

Nowhere has that blessed result been so fully realized as in America, and that sovereign independence of the individual, for which the Catholic Church so long and tirelessly struggled in those distant Dark Ages, is our priceless inheritance in a free land which owes its discovery to the genius of the Catholic Columbus, aided by the Catholic queen, Isabella, acting under the advice of the Catholic priest, Juan Perez. If these facts, interpreted in their true spirit, be brought home to the minds of our non-Catholic fellow-countrymen, can they fail of their desired effect? What a rich field, and fraught with what great results, has not the Catholic writer in the domain of historical literature! He has but to narrate the truth in the spirit of truth to make the American nation Catholic.

Although we have every reason to hope for the future and to congratulate ourselves upon the great opportunities that surround us in a land where the traditional prejudices of the old world have been thrown aside, still we ought not to be blind to the difficulties and dangers which encompass us. In the reaction of the human mind of this century from the impositions of a false Christianity, the rebound is apt to be so great as to carry it to the other extreme. Such a condition now actually confronts us. The trend of modern literature is in the direction of naturalism, and all belief in the supernatural is being fast discarded. We are told, frankly enough, that Christianity is in its decadence, that there is now going on within the bosom of society a process of evolution from that phase of human existence, through which Christianity has been the factor of man's development, to a higher phase wherein Christianity can no longer succor him. The literature of the day is replete with this notion. It abounds in the scientific world, it reëchoes daily in the newspaper, and has become a special function of the modern novel. Its effects are, of course, widespread, and its contagion unavoidable. School children even sepe it in through their class books, and are incipient believers in its dogmas before they have come to realize what it means. This apotheosis of naturalism prevails not only in the scientific and philosophical world, but has taken hold of the public mind. The masses are fast becoming its disciples. Its system of propagandism is contiguous with the limits of civilization. How is this tide of irreligion to be stemmed except by a counteracting influence through the same channels? Where is the citadel of the supernatural except in Catholicity, and who but the Catholic writer has command of its resources? In the province of popular literature, where naturalism is having its most pernicious effect, he must bring to bear the healthful influence of that higher truth of which he alone can be the popular expounder. It need not be formally inculcated; it need never be directly mentioned, but it must be the vivifying principle of his work, the source of its warmth and its light, to be seen only in its effects—in the blossom and odor of the flower. In the magazine, in the daily press, in the essay, in the story, in the novel, in whatever form the printed word takes, his hand should be at work directing and preparing the public mind for the reception of Catholic truth in the fullest sense of the word. Through the mighty agency of the modern press the printed word

has become a power greater than armies; it reaches the millions, and bears the seeds of life or death on its wings to the ends of the earth; it is a force to make or unmake empires; and human society, pliant to its tremendous pressure, bends like the crust of the earth heaved upward by volcanic forces below. This vast power is fast becoming the instrument of naturalism, which proclaims that man is all-sufficient unto himself and needs no God to save him. If falsehood may be propagated by means of the press, may not truth employ the same potent agency? Unless Catholics make use of the means at hand to advocate the truth of their cause, the field will soon be entirely occupied by the enemy, who already have on their side that natural revolt of the mind against the irrational doctrines of the so-called Reformation. It is not sufficient simply to declare the truth; men must be induced to look at it. The faces of those who have abandoned Christianity are averted; they have turned their backs upon the supernatural and refuse to consider its claims at all. Their attention, therefore, must first be gained, their interest aroused, and their intelligent consideration awakened. There is but one way to accomplish this: The Catholic writer must descend into the popular arena. He must embellish his work with all that appeals to the popular fancy. Truth in itself is beautiful to him who sees it; but to closed eyes it is hidden. The difficulty lies in making men so much as glance at it. There is little doubt that they will become ravished with its beauty when they do apprehend it, but its light must first be brought to their intellectual vision. To accomplish this successfully is no small task in an age like ours, when the intervening phantoms of a thousand forms of error play unceasingly before the public imagination, and especially when men entertain a prejudice against Catholic truth through the groundless assumption of its falsehood. The question with the Catholic writer is how to remove that prejudice and lay the vain ghosts of error that haunt men's minds.

Art is the outward expression of the beautiful; beauty is the splendor of truth. It is through an artistic expression that this splendor is to be made visible to the minds of men. Unless he who knows the truth can give expression to its beauty, he may indeed ravish his own soul with its sweetness, but like the light of a hidden sun it is veiled from the sight of his fellow-men. The writer who has truth to tell must be an artist if he wishes to make the splendor of that truth visible to those whom he addresses; the diamond must be so cut and polished that not a facet shall fail to flash its fire. As in sculpture beauty of form in the chiselled marble is the vehicle of the artist's idea, and in painting all the subtle skill of coloring is used to body forth his conception, so in writing the artistic use of words, their lights and shadows, the varying hues of metaphor, the music and rhythm of their setting, should be the glowing medium of the splendor of truth. The successful writer must be an artist in the full sense of the word, a master in the art of fitting aptest words to things. He must both model and paint in words, using them with the same skill and discrimination as the sculptor does his chisel and the painter the colors on his palette. But his art must

be organic; it must be the vital expression of his thought, not rhetorical stucco plastered over fatal defects of construction; it must be the blushing hue of the rose, not the hectic flush of disease, nor the bedizened flare of vanity. If I may be permitted the criticism, I would say, that it is in this respect that Catholic American literature is lacking. It has failed to show adequately that splendor of the truth of which it is in possession. The extenuating circumstances, already enumerated in the beginning of this paper, satisfactorily account for this; the distracting cares of a pioneer career, the want of an audience, the lack of a stimulus, and above all, the attitude of self-defence into which the church has been forced by an aggressive prejudice, have led rather to the development of the virtues of self-repression than a habit of expression.

But the times have changed; we are no longer required to retire to the inner sanctuary of the faith against the bitter attacks of an aggressive foe; our present conditions warrant us in coming forward and manifesting ourselves, declaring the truth that is in us, and revealing the beauty of the face of the Son of Man. How fecund is the church, the divine mother of truth, in the development of art is written in unmistakable characters over the broad face of the civilized world. It was her fostering care that saved to the modern world the art of the ancients; and the development and perfection of Christian art, reflecting the splendor of the truth that ever glows in her divine bosom, was due to the inspiration that breathed from her holy presence. Now, as in the days of Dante and Petrarch, of Raphael and Angelo, her perennial beauty shines undiminished.

> Art is true art when art to God is true,
> And only then.

Who in these days but the Catholic Church teaches God to the nations? Who but she treasures the truths of eternal salvation to dispense to mankind? If, then, she be the custodian of the highest truth, who but she is the source of the sublimest beauty and the noblest art?

What rich promise does not the future hold for Catholic American literature, and how great the dignity of the Catholic writer's mission! Upon him devolves the sublime task of demonstrating that "God is as essential to a people as liberty," and that a voluntary obedience to the divine law is the price of freedom. In his hands alone lies the defence of revelation, for the warring sects are fast yielding to the disintegrating shocks of agnosticism. He alone is henceforth to be the champion of human reason, the vindicator of its dignity in expounding the natural limits of its functions. His the duty of making history speak truth again. Next to that of the priestly office, his the glorious mission of once more making the divine beauty visible to men. Nor need he be timid in entering upon his labors. Let him be bold, let him be persistent in his insistance of the truth he proclaims. He has nothing to fear and all to gain. True to his Catholic principles, true to his American instincts, he cannot go amiss; fearless in proclaiming those principles, staunch in his democratic faith, in this providential land, where all equally

enjoy a fair field, his triumph is assured. The times are indeed changed, but for the better; the long night, which for three centuries has hung over us, is lifting its blanket of darkness, and the dawn draws near, for

> We hear
> A trumpet in the distance pealing news
> Of better, and Hope, a poising eagle, burns
> Above the unrisen morrow.

(Long-continued applause.)

TEMPERANCE.

NINTH REGULAR PAPER, BY JOHN H. CAMPBELL, OF PHILADELHIA.

THERE is no other subject, excepting that of education, which affects so vitally the present and future welfare of the Catholics of the United States. "There can be no manner of doubt," says the last Baltimore council, "that the abuse of intoxicating drinks is to be reckoned among the most deplorable evils of this country. This excess is an unceasing stimulant to vice, and a fruitful source of misery; vast numbers of men and entire families are plunged into hopeless ruin, and multitudes of souls are by it dragged headlong into eternal perdition. Now because the ravages of this vice extend not a little among Catholics, non-Catholics are much scandalized, and a great obstacle is set up against the spread of the true religion. Hence it behooves all Christians to be filled with zeal against this vice, and for the love of God, and of country, to endeavor to root out this pestilent evil."

These words of warning are constantly ringing in our ears. Daily we are reminded of them by the numerous cases of crime, and misery, and degradation reported in the columns of the press. Our hearts sicken at the pictures presented to us, whether it be of a criminal going to the gallows, of a prison filled with victims of drink, of an orphan asylum crowded with the children of intemperate parents, or of a motley crowd of applicants for liquor licenses. We cannot shut our eyes to the gigantic evil in our midst.

In the face of the evils deplored by the fathers of the Baltimore council, it is eminently proper for this congress to consider the subject of "temperance"—not in a slighting or cursory manner, but calmly and deliberately, with a view to taking some action which will arouse our people to the necessity of doing their full share in the battle against intemperance, which is now going on in the United States.

One of the things which excite the wonder of the men and women enlisted in the ranks of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, is the indifference with which the temperance question is regarded. Families are broken up, homes are destroyed, bright intellects are degraded, scandal runs riot with our good name, and souls are lost to the church, and yet there are thousands of worthy people who scarcely give a thought to the causes of this havoc—who actually

regard a "temperance man" as a fanatic. It makes us marvel at the constitution of human nature. But there are hopeful signs of a general awakening. The statesman is beginning to see that sober men make good citizens; the politician is beginning to have some respect for a question that can enlist the services of an army of voters; the teacher is beginning to notice that education is thrown away upon the youth who indulges in drink; the legislator is beginning to turn his attention to the passage of laws restricting the liquor traffic; and the churchman is beginning to note that his work is half done when his congregation is temperate. These are hopeful signs indeed, and presage good for the future of the country And shall we Catholic laymen not take our stand with our fellow-citizens? Shall we remain passive in the good work? Shall we sit idle, when others are trying to stem the tide of intemperance which threatens to engulf our fair land? We would be recreant to our duty if we failed to lift up our voices in favor of taking vigorous action in aid of the temperance cause. Gentlemen, we cannot afford to remain silent.

In discussing the best methods of action, it might be well to take a glance at the various forms of temperance agitation, which have been recently tried in the United States, so that after considering them in the light of comparison, the one with the other, we may be enabled to form our judgment as to what course we shall pursue. (I desire to state right here, that the views upon prohibition and local option expressed in this paper, are my own individual views, and that many Catholics disagree with me.)

First of all, the prohibition movement arrests our attention, not only on account of its great prominence, but because it is claimed by its adherents to be the panacea for all the evils of which we complain. Prohibition under various forms has been tried in several sections of the country, and is at present adopted by law in Maine, Kansas, Iowa, and the two Dakotas. Attempts to engraft it in the constitution of the other states, have of late been disastrous failures. Its friends claim that it accomplishes its ends; its opponents meet this assertion with doubts and denials. To me it seems that the public sentiment of the country is against it, and that as a remedy for the evils of intemperance, it has had its day. Even in Iowa last Tuesday, signs of a reaction were distinctly visible, and it is a mere question of time, in my judgment, when prohibition will be relegated to the domain of dead issues. We must not forget, however, that its advocates are as a body sincere. We must give them credit for earnestness of purpose and a thorough belief in their views, and we must be thankful to them for arousing a public sentiment in favor of temperance reform. As a matter of public policy, they have made a mistake in running counter to the instincts of believers in a republican form of government, and have infringed upon the personal liberty of the citizen, in a matter of personal appetite, which cannot be controlled by legislative edicts. The people have naturally resented such interference, and have so expressed themselves at the polls.

Prohibition is the logical outcome of a mistaken idea of paternal government, which is contrary to the spirit of our institutions.

Next of all comes the local option movement, which might be designated as prohibition in spots. It is argued that though it may be impossible to enforce a general law on account of the mixed character of our population, yet in rural communities and small towns and villages public sentiment will support an attempt to prohibit by law the sale of liquor. This may be true of some sections. Even blue laws have been enforced in New England, and Mormonism still exists in Utah, but the Catholics and others of the minority in New England could not be persuaded that the blue laws were just, any more than the Christian residents of Utah can be convinced that polygamy is the best condition of affairs. In considering the question of local option, we frequently overlook the rights of the minority and take a selfish view of temperance reform. It seems to me that local option laws are but the treatment of diseased spots, which are pruned away only to cause fresh attacks in other places, forgetting that the seat of the disease has not been attacked. The principles involved in local option are the same as those underlying prohibition, their application being limited to a narrower field of action. The same objections apply to them as to the principles of prohibition.

The third prominent form of temperance agitation is high license, and in this the interference with the personal liberty of the citizen is avoided and an endeavor is made to throw some wholesome restrictions around the sale of intoxicating liquors. It is under trial in Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and other states, and much discussion as to its success or non-success is taking place. At first the mere increase in the amount paid for a liquor license was supposed to be all that was necessary to accomplish the desired diminution of the liquor traffic, but thinking men have practically abandoned this position, after the experience of Chicago and other places. At present the high price of the license is supplemented by restrictive features of various kinds, looking to a constant and efficient regulation of the traffic, so that the Christian Sunday will not be desecrated, minors and intemperate persons shall not be furnished with liquors, and the grant of the license shall depend upon the good character of the applicant. Restrictive license would be a better term to use, but the popular mind has settled upon the name, and high license has become almost a technical term. There is undoubtedly much merit in high license enactments, but as yet they are experimental. The extraordinarily successful result achieved in Philadelphia and other places, argues strongly in their favor, but it will take some years yet to fully determine their value. When we find such a noted temperance leader as Archbishop Ireland going beyond them, we naturally suspend judgment as to their positive success as a settlement of the temperance question.

The fourth prominent form of temperance agitation, and the one about which Catholics know the most, is moral suasion. We are all familiar with the work of the great apostle of temperance, Father Mathew. The story of millions induced to take the total abstinence pledge by the pleadings of that noble priest, reads almost like a fairy tale. The account of his great work fills us with enthusiasm, and when we consider the fact that he achieved such marvel-

lous results without the aid of prohibition, local option, high license, or any other form of legislation, it leads us at first blush to pronounce in favor of moral suasion as the true remedy for the evils of intemperance. His work still lives. It is the spirit which has animated every Catholic temperance man since he first signed the pledge. It is the foundation stone of the present Catholic total abstinence movement. It will continue, as long as drunkards need to be saved and men need to be warned against the evils of drink, to inspire earnest temperance advocates to follow his example. Bu where are the millions who took the pledge from him? Where is the reformation in the drinking habits of his converts? Where are the numerous societies which sprung into existence as if by magic at the sound of his voice? Church councils in America and Ireland still deplore the existence of intemperance as a gigantic evil. The Holy Father himself has but recently called attention to the "destructive vice." The children have not followed in the footsteps of their fathers, and even the fathers themselves forget to remain examples of sobriety to their children. Moral suasion seems to be a partial failure, like all the other forms of temperance agitation thus far tried..

It is rather an unsatisfactory glance which we have taken. We know that a mighty evil exists. We have seen the trial of various attempts to eradicate it, and we have noted, with disappointment, the results. Is not, therefore, the prospect for temperance reform discouraging? If no remedy yet proposed has fully accomplished its purpose, shall we not despair of final success? Can the delegates to this congress safely commit themselves to any pronouncement or take any action upon the temperance question as it now stands? The unthinking man might say no, but the thinking man will promptly say yes. Especially will the Catholic, who has repeatedly seen the church grapple with evil, and successfully combat it, declare that intemperance must be conquered by the church, just as every other form of vice will be conquered. The power of religion must be invoked to aid the efforts of men, and as believers in the true faith, we must allow no idea to enter our minds that because the remedies that have been tried have not been successful it is useless to try others.

Let us therefore bend our efforts to discover a method by which Catholics can lend their aid to the cause of temperance reform. This great centennial celebration must not go by without some declaration to the country that the Catholic laity are alive to the dangers of intemperance and have resolved to do their full share against the common enemy of all mankind. We have seen how the fathers of the church, when last assembled in plenary council, have spoken with no uncertain voice. They have invoked a blessing "upon the cause of temperance and upon all who are laboring for its advancement in a true Christian spirit." Let us obtain that blessing by performing our share of the labor.

First of all, let us stamp our disapproval upon the vice of intemperance. Says the Holy Father in his brief to Most Rev. Archbishop Ireland, dated the 27th of March, 1887: "Nor can we suf-

ficiently praise the prelates of the United States, who recently in the plenary council of Baltimore with weightiest words condemned this abuse, declaring it to be a perpetual incentive to sin and a fruitful root of all evils, plunging the families of the intemperate into direst ruin, and dragging numberless souls down to everlasting perdition; declaring moreover that the faithful who yield to this vice of intemperance become thereby a scandal to non-Catholics and a great hindrance to the propagation of the true religion." Let us declare that drunkenness among Catholics should be considered as a disgrace to their manhood, and that he who commits the sin of intemperance shall be held in reprobation by his fellow-men. Once throw the weight of public opinion against the man who over-indulges in drink, whether it be in the enjoyment of social life, the pleasures of friendly associations, the celebrations of joyful occasions, or the excitements of business activity, and a big step forward is made towards reducing the evils of drink.

Secondly. Let us commend the work of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, and urge upon all Catholics to assist it. "And above all," says the Holy Father, "we have rejoiced to learn with what energy and zeal, by means of various excellent associations, and especially through the Catholic total abstinence union, you combat the destructive vice of intemperance. Hence," continues he, "we esteem worthy of all commendation the noble resolve of your pious associations, by which they pledge themselves to abstain totally from every kind of intoxicating drink. Nor can it be doubted that this determination is the proper and the truly efficacious remedy for this very great evil, and that so much the more strongly will all be induced to put this bridle upon appetite, by how much greater are the dignity and influence of those who give the example."

Presuming as we do, to speak in a certain sense for the Catholic laity of our country, the greater the dignity and influence of our deliberations, the more need for an emphatic endorsement of the work of that union, which is so highly commended by the Holy Father himself.

Thirdly. Let us pronounce in favor of the passage and enforcement of laws, forbidding the sale of liquors to minors and intemperate persons. The Baltimore council in warning saloon keepers of the dangers attached to their business, says, "They must not sell drink to minors, that is to say, to those who have not come of age; nor to those who they foresee will abuse it." We can certainly, as citizens, do our share in enforcing this decree, by recommending Catholics to vote for laws which will put it into effect. The evils of selling drink to children are patent to all. We cannot complain if our children become drunkards, if they are permitted, by our negligence, to obtain liquor at the saloon, under authority of law. We have been too careless in this regard. In the great cities of the country we are losing thousands of our youth, through the disregard of our duty as citizens. Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, and some others have inaugurated a reform in the matter of selling liquors to minors. Let their example shame some of their sisters

to do likewise, and let us throw the weight of our influence to advise Catholics throughout the country to vote for laws against the sale of liquor to minors, and I may add, to drunkards also.

Fourthly. Let us strongly urge the passage and enforcement of laws forbidding the opening of saloons on Sunday. The Baltimore council has decreed that "Catholics engaged in the sale of intoxicating drinks" must keep their saloons closed on Sunday. The pastoral letter of the archbishops and bishops uses the following strong language:

"There is one way of profaning the Lord's day which is so prolific of evil results that we consider it our duty to utter against it a special condemnation. This is the practice of selling beer or other liquors on Sunday, or of frequenting places where they are sold. This practice tends more than any other to turn the day of the Lord into a day of dissipation—to use it as an occasion for breeding intemperance. While we hope that Sunday laws on this point will not be relaxed, but even more rigidly enforced, we implore all Catholics, for the love of God and of country, never to take part in such Sunday traffic, nor to patronize or countenance it. And we not only direct the attention of all pastors to the repression of this abuse, but we also call upon them to induce all of their flocks that may be engaged in the sale of liquors to abandon as soon as they can the dangerous traffic, and to embrace a more becoming way of making a living."

And in the decrees of the council we find the following language: "Catholics should generously renounce all recreations and all kinds of business which may interfere with keeping holy the Lord's day, or which are calculated to lead to the violation of the laws of God or of the state. The worst, without doubt, is the carrying on of business in bar-rooms and saloons on Sunday, a traffic by means of which so many and such grievous injuries are done to religion and society."

With such words before us we should not hesitate to speak out boldly, recommending to our Catholic people to take advanced ground in favor of Sunday observance, and to reinforce their opinions, wherever necessary, by their ballots.

With these resolves, we might rest content for the present. Perhaps we ought not to go further, but there can be but little doubt, as faithful children of the church, that we should go that far. Let us resolve—

First. That drunkenness should be made odious.

Second. That the Catholic Total Abstinence Union should be practically encouraged and sustained.

Third. That Catholics should favor the passage and enforcement of laws forbidding the sale of liquors to minors and intoxicated persons.

Fourth. That Catholics should favor the rigid closing of saloons upon Sunday.

In these four resolves lie the best solution of the temperance question. With the carrying out of them in spirit and effect a public sentiment will be created in favor of temperance reform which

will minimize the evils of intemperance. No longer will the Catholic name be associated with the scandal of drink, no longer will the Holy Father and the bishops be called upon to deplore "the destructive vice," no longer will the people despair of the future of our country. Throw the weight of our Catholic influence in favor of true temperance reform, as outlined by the action of the church authorities, and non-Catholics will turn to us, as did the Hebrews of Egypt to Moses, to lead them out of the land of bondage and into the promised land. Let us not let the Catholic centennial go by without a mighty effort to place Catholics far in advance upon the question of temperance.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

TENTH REGULAR PAPER, BY MANLY TELLO, OF CLEVELAND, O.

Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Catholic American Lay Congress: The question of a proper Sunday observance is exercising the American public mind, and there is that variety of sentiment upon the subject to be expected where so many and inexact standards of religious and irreligious thought prevail. The necessity of a day of rest is universally accepted. The contentions are over the moral obligations of Sunday as the established day of rest. A well informed Catholic needs no general instruction as to the essential observance of the Sunday. To him it is a day of special religious obligations and of rest; so established by his church. But in dealing with the public question of Sunday observance, the Catholic has to do with the rights of others, and has to take into practical consideration the state of American society in which he lives. We have neither the duty nor the right to establish a Catholic Sunday in the United States, but certainly the church that created the Sunday as a holy-day is best entitled to explain her reasons and object in so doing, and should at least be permitted to expound her legislation, when this Sunday question is debated from an avowedly Christian standpoint. And the assertion of this Catholic primacy is further useful, since it bespeaks from a reasonable American public respectful hearing for authoritative Catholic expositions on the subject, those expositions affording a refuge from the extremes of Puritan and free-thinker, one of whom hates the Christian Sunday, while the other would make the Christian Sunday hated.

Yet Catholic exposition in mere theory will not altogether avail, example holding faster than precept. Catholic action on the Sunday is what will most tell; and particularly our public acts, outside the walls of our churches. So it becomes the Catholic American body to guard lest it give scandal by indulging in things even permissible, but which with the prevailing manners of our country prove offensive. And in kind, though not always in degree, those manners are to be supported. The dominant manners of our country are the manners of Americans, and we are Americans. This, though, necessitates the frank statement that among our coreligionists there

are imported national modes as yet unassimilated to our Americanism. This foreignism exists also outside of the Catholic body. But, within it, the oneness of Catholicity shall best avail to amalgamate those modes into American character.

What is well elsewhere may not be well here. The vital point is in the fact that there is a distinctive American way, and a people has the right to its own individuality. Both creed and country are advanced by this oneness. These remarks, appearing to discriminate between citizens, demand an explanation that plunges us at once into review of a condition that has important bearing on the Sunday question. The writer has a life-long rooted aversion to using foreign terms, as "German" or "Irish," in connection with American citizens. But, it would be impossible to treat of affairs as they are, without borrowing a terminology that so exists in practice that it is necesary to use it to express our meaning. When he mentions American manners he means such as are characteristic of Americans, whether native or foreign-born, Catholic or sectarian. But he realizes that there are those who choose to remain distinctively foreign in our midst, and to be so designated. And so far as this fact bears upon Sunday observance, it has to be dealt with in this paper. For instance, those who call themselves "German" and act out German manners, are not in accord with the leading American lines as to Sunday observance. The German demands a greater license for that day, and particularly in a direction that is specially obnoxious to Americans, viz., the open beer garden. In this the Catholic Germans are largely in line with German sects.

This complicates the Sunday question. It weakens our influence in connection with a proper American observance of the day. For without self-praise, we can say of Americans that they are a thoughtful, reasonable, and indulgent people, cosmopolitan, as our conditions would naturally effect.

Now the average American, averse to Puritanism, and yet confronted with the German demand for Sunday license—in which he would find Catholic, as well as Protestant and infidel German, agreed—would be apt, both through racial and religious affinity, to prefer the Puritan over-zeal to the German looseness; and, owing to the Catholic German attitude, he would likely dismiss the idea of Catholicity as an ally or guide to proper Sunday observance.

The writer has no desire to criticise the European German in his continental Sunday observance; but what may be very suitable elsewhere is quite unsuited here; a source both of sin and scandal. In our present American conditions, the open beer-garden leads to desecration of the Sunday, and is not to be tolerated. This is a universal feeling with Americans, shared alike by Catholic and Protestant, whether originally of German, Irish, or other race.

Still more odious to the American mind is the open saloon on Sunday—open and yet concealed. On this subject the Catholic Church in the United States has spoken with no uncertain voice. We quote from the pastoral letter of the fathers of the third plenary council of Baltimore: "There is one way of profaning the Lord's day, which is so prolific of evil results that we consider it our duty to utter

against it a special condemnation. This is the practice of selling beer or other liquors on Sunday, or of frequenting places where they are sold. This practice tends more than any other to turn the day of the Lord into a day of dissipation, to use it as an occasion for breeding intemperance. While we hope that Sunday laws on this point will not be relaxed, but even more rigidly enforced, we implore all Catholics, for the love of God and of country, never to take part in such Sunday traffic, nor to patronize or countenance it. And we not only direct the attention of all pastors to the repression of this abuse, but we also call upon them to induce all of their flocks that may be engaged in the sale of liquors to abandon as soon as they can the dangerous traffic, and to embrace a more becoming way of making a living."

Can the transgressing saloonist remain an unchid and pretentious member of the congregation?

Properly enforced civil laws could effectuate this plenary council legislation. It is an established principle of American law that the Sunday can be protected from desecration. It is a social duty that the state owes to the body of its citizens who are Christians. They must be free to an undisturbed worship.

Are all the varied, honest, honorable, and lucrative occupations of men to be closed to them by law on Sunday, and the doors of the saloon alone to be thrown wide open, for a traffic which not only defies the respect due the day, but actually makes it *privileged* to a debauchery that sends its signal damning effects into every other day of the week? The tradesman is estopped from collecting his debt on Sunday; the open saloon should not be permitted to forestall his due. Are the Sunday closing laws to be mere decoys to the Sunday open saloon? And are not six days of that traffic sufficient to the evil thereof?

As it stands, the day may come when the etymologist will ingeniously derive Sunday from saloon-day, the day immemorially devoted by law to the interests of the saloons. How does it look to a reverential Protestant to see men and youth pass over from the Catholic church into the saloon — some of them to spend the greater part of the rest of the day there? Though the writer's observation, is that the young men who form this saloon habit shortly abandon recourse to the sacraments, and soon after give up the practice of attending Mass. What is the public appearance and what the language of too many of these delinquents when they come out of the saloon? Yet opposite our churches, or in their immediate neighborhood, is the location most affected by these saloonists. Is it any wonder that Protestants should twit us with these open derelictions? That they point at this offending and tell us to look at our "Irish Catholics," and how *they* keep their Sunday?

Truly we could point with just pride to Catholic Irish reverence for the Lord's day, and Sunday obligations earnestly and devoutly fulfilled. But those hundreds of thousands are unseen, while the evil work of the miserable few is seen. The Catholic saloonist and his Catholic patrons are there to deface the otherwise edifying Sunday observance. The morals of the transgressors are injured;

and even the charitable and well inclined among our separated brethren are scandalized.

These, then, are two leading features in connection with Sunday observance, to which the Catholic American body must pay practical attention: 1st. The German latitude in observing the day. 2d. The open saloon on Sunday. Catholic public opinion must be directed against these obstacles. And when we are of one mind and one in action, then we can expect to mould American sentiment at large to a correct idea of the Sunday and its proper observance, removed alike from Puritanism or licentiousness.

It is certainly no valid objection to say that this would be a conceding of other nationalities to American feeling on the subject. The American has the highest right to mould manners on this soil. And if within Catholic lines there are two ways to do a thing, and one is exclusively American, for that very reason that way should be universally adopted. Yet the truth is, that customs that are perhaps innocuous in other lands *are* occasions of sin and of Sunday desecration in our mixed communities; and beer-garden and theatre, open on the Sunday, are of such a character here, and to be denounced.

I know that it vexes to read the unmerited attacks made on the Catholic body in connection with Sunday observance. False witness is borne against us from pulpit and press. The faults of certain classes in our body are magnified, and what Catholic authority really teaches is suppressed. There is at times passing temptation to retaliate, but we must be patient for the general good. Especially when we recall the failings within our own body on which we have dwelt, and which have served to misrepresent us even with really well inclined sectarians. To retort on them that great private wrong may easily be done by persons in their own ranks who outwardly observe the Sunday and denounce the publican, is not to the purpose. What we should seek is an *en rapport* with the Protestant Christians who desire to keep the Sunday holy. We cannot go over to the Judaic rigidity of the Puritan Sabbath; but we can bring the Protestant masses over to the reverent moderation of the Catholic Sunday. To effect this, though, we must set our faces sternly against the foreign license and open saloon features now so largely defended or practised by Catholic adherents. The issue is of the utmost gravity and calls for Catholic united action.

What a dilemma for the Catholic workingman to fulfil the Mass obligation, were not the Sunday made a day of abstinence from labor! It is for us, then, to well guard the sanctity of the Sunday, while preserving it further, in Christian charity, to the poor man, not only as a day of special worship, but of rest and proper recreation.

Open gardens or parks, sacred concerts, open museums of art, open libraries—these all are morally healthful, permissible for the Sunday, the one only day of the week that the laborer can call his own. The Catholic is obliged to his Mass. That sweet and strengthening obligation fulfilled, the writer believes that in many cases the highest act of worship that could be evoked would arise outside of the sanctuary itself, under God's sky, out in the woods, amid the

green fields — scenes of nature replete with God's handiwork, and debarred to his humble toilers except on that sacred first day of the week. Catholic societies should never make it a day for useless public demonstration, and when they do march in a body with music, to corner-stone laying, or for other unobjectionable purpose, care should be taken not to disturb non-Catholic services.

I advocate, then, that Catholics, despite rebuff and injustice, overlooking zealotry, seek alliance with Protestant Christians for proper Sunday observance They are right in the principle they cling to, though wrong in the application of it. The infidel is altogether wrong. Their misguided zeal could work us less harm than the license that looks mainly to the dissipations of the day, or the disbelief that seeks to destroy its sanctity.

Were workers paid on the Monday, and saloons closed by law at 6 P. M. on Saturdays, much of the Sunday problem would be satisfactorily solved. The brewery-capitalized saloons would no longer enrich foreign syndicates at the expense of native morals.

There are many other Christian issues in which Catholic and Protestant could come together and shape civil legislation for the public weal, as in this question of a proper observance of the Sunday. And that we are Catholics demands from us a princely courtesy to our opponents; *noblesse oblige*.

LABOR AND CAPITAL.

ELEVENTH REGULAR PAPER, BY WILLIAM RICHARDS, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

It may well be said that all the burning questions of the day, pertaining to labor and capital, the production and distribution of wealth, and the condition of the working classes, virtually constitute one great social problem. Our Holy Father, the Pope, recently declared that charity alone can solve this problem. This is the theme of my discourse.

I do not discuss the details of labor organizations, the adjustment of capital and labor, the distribution of the proceeds of production, or the like; but I offer some historical illustrations in order to contrast the social condition of "former ages when," as the Holy Father said,* "the mission of charity was acknowledged and accepted by all," with the social condition of later ages in which "free competition" has been substituted for charity. The first illustration which I offer is drawn from the introduction to Motley's history of "The Rise of the Dutch Republic," in which, after rapidly sketching the origin of the people of Batavia, their gradual advancement from the beginning of the Christian era, their wonderful domination of sea and land, and their extraordinary progress until about the time of the Reformation (so-called), the author sums up the results of their development in these graphic words:

*Address to the French workingmen Sunday, October 20, 1889.

"Thus * fifteen ages have passed away, and in the place of a horde of savages, living among swamps and thickets, swarm 3,000,000 people, the most industrious, the most prosperous, perhaps the most intelligent under the sun. * * * Their national industry was untiring; their prosperity unexampled; their love of liberty indomitable; their pugnacity proverbial. * * * Their women were distinguished by beauty of form and vigor of constitution. Accustomed from childhood to converse freely with all classes in the daily walks of life, and to travel on foot or horseback from one town to another, without escort and without fear, they had acquired manners more frank and independent than those of women in other lands, while their morals were pure and their decorum undoubted. * * * Within the little circle which encloses the seventeen provinces were 208 walled cities, many of them the most stately in Christendom, 150 chartered towns, 6,300 villages, with their watch towers and steeples, besides numerous other more insignificant hamlets; the whole guarded by a belt of sixty fortresses of surpassing strength."

While the historian omitted to emphasize the fact that from about the year 750 the Catholic religion had been the all-prevailing religion of this people, yet he did not fail to declare that "the standard of culture" in the flourishing cities of Ghent, Bruges, Antwerp, etc., "was elevated, compared with that observed in many parts of Europe. The children of the wealthier classes enjoyed great facilities for education in all the great capitals. The classics, music, and the modern languages, particularly the French, were universally cultivated. Nor was intellectual cultivation confined to the higher orders. On the contrary, it was diffused to a remarkable degree among the hard-working artisans and handicraftsmen of the great cities."

The author then alludes to "the numerous guilds by which citizenship was acquired in the various cities"; to the "many other societies for mutual improvement, support, or recreation"; to the "great architectural brotherhood of Germany, to which the magnificent works of Gothic architecture in the middle ages are mainly attributable"; and especially the "many splendid and elaborately finished churches in the provinces"; to the "military sodalities" whose "yearly festivals were always held with great solemnity and rejoicing"; and lastly to the "Guilds of Rhetoric which existed in all the principal cities," and indeed "in the most obscure villages," and were "associations of mechanics, weavers, smiths, gardeners, and traders, for the purpose of amusing their leisure with poetical effusions, dramatic and musical exhibitions, theatrical processions, and other harmless and not inelegant recreations." These guilds of rhetoric "came originally in the fifteenth century from France," "spread with great celerity throughout the Netherlands," "were of great value in drawing the people of the provinces into closer union." and "became important political engines" which "the sovereigns were always anxious to conciliate by becoming members

* Vol. I, page 90, edition of 1858.

of them in person." Periodic jubilees were celebrated in various capital cities, when "all the guilds of rhetoric in the Netherlands were invited to partake and to compete in magnificent processions, brilliant costumes, living pictures, charades, and other animated glittering groups, and in trials of dramatic and poetic skill, all arranged under the superintendence of the particular association which, in the preceding year, had borne away the prize."

In these brilliant pen pictures, Mr. Motley omits to mention that every one of those festivals and jubilees was commenced by a devout and magnificent celebration of solemn high Mass. He does condescend, however, to testify that, "These literary guilds befitted and denoted a people which was alive, a people which had neither sunk to sleep in the lap of material prosperity, nor abased itself in the sty of ignorance and political servitude. The spirit of liberty pervaded these rude but not illiterate assemblies."

Rude, forsooth! A people so upright, orderly, and chivalric that a woman could travel from one town to another, all through the seventeen provinces, without escort and without fear, a rude people! But we will not quarrel with the historian's standard of rudeness while he says: "The spirit of liberty pervaded these rude but not illiterate assemblies, and her fair proportions were distinctly visible even through the somewhat grotesque garb which she assumed."

If the "spirit of liberty" in those "rude" times had only been smart enough to put on the beautiful "garb" which she assumes at our modern "fests" and picnics where the participants guzzle lager beer, chase the greased pig, and wind up with the enticing and voluptuous round dance, how much more admirable she would have been in the eyes of the modern "advanced thinker"!

Specially worthy of quotation by way of contrast with the persistent but erroneous assertions of those enemies of the Catholic Church who declare that she had no schools in the middle ages and kept her people in ignorance, is that striking paragraph which stands out like a radiant jewel in the midst of the author's splendid description of "the chief city of the Netherlands, the commercial capital of the world—Antwerp": "The condition of her population was prosperous. There were but few poor, and those did not seek, but were sought by the almoners. The schools were excellent and cheap. It was difficult to find a child of sufficient age who could not read, write, and speak at least two languages."

Truly these are pleasing pictures, and we naturally inquire: Why could not the historian have carefully studied a social, religious, and political system which prevailed so long before the Reformation, and produced such splendid results, with a view to discovering its vitalizing principles, and explaining them for the illumination of "seekers after truth" in times all out of joint, like ours? But of course it would never occur to one like Motley, enveloped as he was in the blazing noon-day light of the nineteenth century, that the system whose fruits he described in such glowing colors owed anything to the Catholic religion, or to the teachings of the Catholic Church; nor would he have admitted that the appalling calamities

which befell Europe immediately after the Reformation, and which he describes in such lurid colors, were due entirely to the departure of the world from the principles and teachings of the Catholic Church.

Mr. Motley imagined that he was wiser than the church, and so, instead of endeavoring to analyze and elucidate that wonderful system, he deplored the low ideas of human rights which then prevailed; for, after alluding to the "liberties" conferred upon guilds by virtue of which they had the right of representation in town and other governments, he said: "In later days loftier ideas of human rights, larger conceptions of commerce have taught mankind the difference between liberties and liberty, between guilds and free competition."

Liberty and free competition! This was the watchword of the new order of things. Had Motley but listened to his master, Carlyle, whose peculiar style he was such a bungler in imitating, he would have learned that this boasted liberty, after 300 years of the blessings of the Reformation, had "turned out to be for the working millions a liberty to die by want of food; for idle thousands and units, alas! a still more fatal liberty to live in want of work, to have no earnest duty to do in this, God's world, any more."

And then as to "free competition." Motley could have read these burning words of Carlyle in "Past and Present": "We coldly see the all-conquering, valiant sons of toil sit enchanted, by the million, in the poor-law Bastile, as if this were nature's law; mumbling to ourselves some vague janglement of *laissez faire*, supply and demand, cash payment, the one nexus of man to man: 'Free trade, competition, and devil take the hindmost,' our latest gospel yet preached."

If this be rhetoric—the red-hot, fiery rhetoric of Carlyle—then let me cite, for the benefit of the admirers of Motley, some telling figures taken from a recent census. By way of contrast with Motley's glowing pictures of the condition of the Netherlands before the Reformation, let us look at Belgium of the present day. Belgium, as all know, is only a portion of the Netherlands. And what do we find there now? With a population which has increased from 4,064,000 in 1832 to 5,520,090 at a recent census, and with great and prosperous manufacturing industries, yet in spite of this increase and this prosperity, Belgium has a vast deal of poverty within her borders; pauperism is everywhere. According to an official report, out of 908,000 families in a recent year only 89,000 were wealthy, while 373,000 were in straitened circumstances, and 446,000 families were in a state of wretchedness.

And these are the choice fruits of what Motley called "free competition"! What a contrast is here presented between two orders of social existence in the same land? The first, so brilliantly described by Motley as prevailing in the seventeen provinces before the Reformation, was what Carlyle called a true society with mutual helpfulness, based, as I may add, upon the divinely ordered brotherhood of man and inspired by the charity of the Catholic Church which enveloped the *whole* community! The other shows, accord-

ing to Carlyle, "a condition of totallest separation and isolation" between the employers and the poor, "whose life, cloaked under due laws of war named fair competition and so forth, is a mutual hostility, where men have forgotten that cash payment is *not* the sole relation of human beings," is not the potent solvent of all obligations!

Here indeed is a melancholy contrast! Will it be said that the example is on too small a scale? that the societary condition of the Netherlands before the Reformation was not a fair sample of Europe? Then let me cite the testimony of Froude, who, though he may be a historical romancer, or a romantic historian, yet has the ability to see and sometimes the fairness to tell the truth in most vivid language. Speaking of those old days before the Reformation, Froude says: "In the alteration of our own character we have lost the key which would interpret the character of our fathers; and the great men of our own English history before the Reformation seem to us almost like the fossil skeletons of another order of beings."* Of course, we do not admit that the intelligent Catholic has "lost the key," or does not fully appreciate the great men of England before the Reformation, though the remark may be true enough of Protestants. Again, according to Froude: "It is no easy matter to throw ourselves back into a time in which *for centuries* the *European world* grew upon a single type!"

What was that type? Not the feudal system, nor what is commonly called the mediæval type. The chief characteristic of the type I refer to, the basis on which it was constructed, was the village community, called the "Town" in England, the "Commune" in France, the "Fueros" in Spain, the "Mark" in Germany, the "Mir" in Russia. This was the unit of the social and political system which Sir Henry Maine maintained came down from the good old patriarchal age, and was founded upon the profoundest faith of primitive men in the fatherhood of God and its necessary corollary, the brotherhood of man. In that patriarchal community it was intended that every member should have a home, from the cradle to the grave, and the principle of mutual aid was perennial. Here the system of local self-government originated and flourished; for here every member or freeman, including the priest, the lord, the farmer, the baker, the tailor, the blacksmith, the goldsmith, the weaver, the vine-dresser, all participated, speaking and voting in the annual and other town meetings.

When the church came and preached Christianity to the Keltic, Teutonic, Saxon, and other peoples who dwelt in the village communities throughout Europe, and had dwelt in them for ages, upon beginning with the original Aryan home, the town in England was in process of time converted into the parish, in which, under the teaching of the church, a brave and noble people was trained up, and the principles of freedom, the glorious Magna Charta, and the free parliament of England were developed, and from which were derived the principles and ideas of our own magnificent constitution.

---

* "History of England," Vol. I, page 12, (Scribner 1871.)

Then flourished the "Ages of Faith" in spite of the evils of the feudal system, and "in those days," as Carlyle said, "a heavenly awe overshadowed and encompassed all earthly business whatsoever." "The youth, on awakening in this wondrous universe, found a competent theory of its wonders. If he asked himself, What is man? What are the duties of man? the answer stood ready written for him." Not then was he "perplexed with storms and passionate questionings of destiny." Not then was there any occasion for a poor, distraught Robert Elsmere! For then "mother church propounded the ancient ground-plan of the All," "the divine idea of the world!"

In those ages, under this societary system, every man who appeared in the town or parish — and there were 6,300 such towns in the Netherlands alone — was obliged to give an account of himself, and was not allowed to hang around like a loafer, and sponge or swindle his living indefinitely; every one knew his neighbor; under the influence of the church a wholesome public opinion was generated, which made itself felt upon every individual; beautiful and edifying social and religious customs and traditions were developed and cherished, and were preserved from decay for centuries by corresponding practices; every citizen was trained in the town government to practise his duties, and to know his rights, and "knowing, dared maintain" them.* In a land filled with such local institutions. together with the numerous church and trade guilds, the magnificent cathedrals, the innumerable churches, and the vast number of beneficent monasteries which William Cobbett said, dotted England every six miles, and were equally numerous in Ireland, with their free schools, and large domains, where any poor man could get work and thus be saved from pauperism and starvation—in such a land it came to pass that for more than 1,500 years of the Christian era a poor law was never needed; the horrid work-house was never seen; pauperism, as we have it, was never heard of, and the land was not covered or cursed with godless tramps, or hoodlums, or professional anarchists, or reeking slums of pauperism, or atheistic political economists who treat the human laborer as a brute machine for the production of wealth, or, lastly, with that unspeakably base crowd of "bulls" and "bears," who get up "corners" on the means of human subsistence, and lie, and cheat, and steal in every commercial exchange in the civilized world.

What a contrast between our surroundings, our societary conditions, and that venerable and efficient system which started with the patriarchs in the dawn of time and culminated in the glorious "Ages of Faith." When King Henry VIII, in the early days of his reign, while he was yet a Catholic, made a "royal progress"

* Men who their duties know;
But know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain.

From Sir William Jones' ode on, "What Constitutes a State?" An ode which could have been written only by one who had felt and imbibed the spirit of regulated liberty, developed by the town-meeting system.

through England, he saw no work-houses, but everywhere comparative comfort and prosperity, and a yeomanry which, though degenerating, still retained many of the traits of what Æneas Silvius (Pope Pius II, 1458) called the noblest yeomanry in Europe.

But when, some forty or fifty years later, Queen Elizabeth made another "royal progress" through the kingdom, after the monasteries had been confiscated and despoiled, the lands appropriated by the corrupt agents of the crown, when the guilds were becoming lifeless, the poor were thrown out to shift for themselves, the altars of the churches were broken down and the Blessed Sacrament no longer there, the scenes that met the queen's eyes were so changed that she exclaimed with astonishment, "The land is covered with paupers!"

Even then the modern gospel of Mammon had begun to show its terrible effects. For this new gospel of individualism and self-assertion, with its protest against the pope, and its rebellion against the divine authority of the church, had removed the two grand safeguards of Christian society—charity and confession. For, how can there be Christian charity when men are cut off from participation in the body and blood of our Lord? And confession being abolished, what was there to stop the speedy vanishing of the old safeguards of the various guilds, and the wholesome restraints of village community life? What could hinder the outbreak of the new-fangled license of unrestrained individual competition, which had never so existed from the beginning of the world, and which John Stuart Mill said in his day was almost unknown and unfelt among the greater part of mankind? Under the old system confession was the universal watchman which insured obedience to the golden rule; and no policemen, other than the ordinary town officers, were needed. But under the new conditions, confession being abolished, appoint any number of watchmen, and then came up the old proverb quoted by Froude: *Quis custodiet custodem?* Who shall watch the watchman?

Gone was the great and salutary custodian! And in place thereof came the new gospel and in due time the modern commercial system which, ignoring all demands of charity, pitted every man's intense selfishness against that of his neighbor—thus making the neighbor an envious rival and in most cases a bitter enemy. Hence, too, has come that school of cold-blooded political economists who proclaim with unblushing effrontery, characteristic of those who deduce man from the tadpole, that "notions of justice have nothing whatever to do with compensation for labor," and "that all such notions are mere sentimentalism!"* What wonder that under such teachings "free competition" proved to be freedom to defraud and oppress the laborer, freedom to adulterate everything we eat, drink, or wear—and John Bright said, "adulteration is only another form of competition"—or else freedom to suffer the agonies of hunger, neglect, and despair, and finally, as Carlyle exclaimed, "Liberty to die by honest starvation!"

It is not necessary to read the "Bitter Cry" of London,

**The Nation*, January 29, 1885.

or the painful pictures of the poor women of New York drawn by Helen Campbell, or innumerable other essays of a similar kind, to learn the dreadful effects of this fearful contrivance called "free competition." Only go with an experienced St. Vincent-of-Paul visitor down into the by-ways and dirty alleys of this or any other city, enter the miserable tenements of the poor, and see how families or squads of human beings are huddled together in dark apartments, in rickety houses, in filthy rooms, where decency is put to shame, and thousands of human beings are degraded almost below the level of the brute!

If miserable savages, in their almost total loss of the original and salutary traditions of the race, have become so degraded, ignorant, and improvident that there are times when they are glad to get dogs, snakes, lizards, or worms to live on, what shall we say of the boasted civilization of this nineteenth century which has reduced millions of its population to such hungry poverty that they are glad to glean from the swill-tubs of the rich, and even drag from the shambles to their wretched hovels the repulsive entrails of slaughtered animals?

Such is the dismal picture presented in every city and considerable town in this great republic, in England, and in short wherever "free competition" has obtained sway. And such use does the civilization of this age, with all its boasted progress and science, make of vast multitudes of human beings to whom God gave immortal souls and an eternal destiny. I do not overlook the assertions of certain political economists who, by a skilful collocation of facts and a sophistical array of figures, endeavor to show that the general condition of laborers is improved, that they are getting higher wages and live better than in some former ages. But I do not hesitate to assert with Devas and other writers that these statements are false, that in fact the comparatively few rich are getting richer, the multitudinous poor are getting more numerous and poorer, and that pauperism is more general, more wretched, and more rapidly increasing than in any former age of the world.

With such results staring us in the face in all parts of the civilized world, is it surprising that there should be a spirit of inquiry and unrest everywhere; that a loss of faith should follow in the track of such misery and injustice; that wild agrarian speculations and revolutionary schemes should abound; and that even a spirit of anarchy should threaten the good order of society? Is not the outlook so dark and threatening as to fill us almost with despair? And a most discouraging feature of the situation is that so many even of our most intelligent Catholics, who, by a proper understanding of history and their religion, ought to be able to furnish a solution of our troubles, show themselves inadequate to the occasion, tamely accepting the situation as inevitable, saying "it always has been so, and always will be so," and then, by way of justification, even quoting the words of our divine Lord: "The poor ye have always with you."

Is that what our Lord meant by that saying? Did he mean that, because the poor are always with us, men were to abandon the

idea of the brotherhood of man as the basis of human society, and ignore the great truth that they are bound by their common interest in the God-man, the mediator, to so constitute their social arrangements that every human being shall have the opportunity of filling his proper place and accomplishing his true work in this world?

Did our Lord mean that this natural home should be broken up, family ties disrupted, the duties of brotherhood abjured, and all turned loose, so to speak, like so many Ishmaelites, in a cut-purse and cut-throat scramble in which the strongest, the keenest, and the meanest should gather the spoils, and the weakest go to the wall?

Did our Lord mean that the highest duty of the state is simply to abolish club law, and protect property, and allow speculators to organize exchanges in which to manipulate their combinations, misrepresentations, and falsehoods, in order to deceive and rob each other and plunder the "lambs," and by their huge operations affect all branches of commerce, unsettle all the safe calculations of legitimate trade, foster a spirit of wild speculation, promoting a grasping greed to gain something for nothing, and destroying all standards of justice and common honesty?

Did our Lord mean that the rich should have privileges not accorded to laborers—that the wealthy owners of great railroad and telegraph lines, big distilleries and breweries, Standard-Oil companies, and the like, when finding their business suffering from sharp competition, may combine and pool their issues with impunity, taxing a helpless public *ad libitum* in order to swell their own ill-gotten gains; yet when the laborers, whose live capital is their intelligence, skill, and strong hands, coöperate in order to forestall or ward off the evils of a ruinous competition of man against man—hand against hand—then, forsooth, their combination must be denounced as dangerous and tyrannical? Is there any justice in that?

Or has there been a special relaxation of the moral code in favor of the rich owners of stock companies; so that they may at pleasure add millions of watered stock to their real stock, and then tax the entire public so that they may net an income of five to fifty per cent or more, not only upon the real capital stock, but also upon the "water" which cost them nothing? Where is the honesty of such transactions?

And, again, is it honest or brotherly on the part of these capitalists to hire men to go about the streets to preach communism and anarchy, and to threaten the use of dynamite or bomb shells, until honest, conservative people are frightened out of their wits and are diverted from the rascalities of the rich conspirators?

And, lastly, let it be remembered that when our Lord spoke of the "poor," such pauperism as we have now was unknown—did not exist on the face of the earth.

Now I have presented these salient points, which by no means exhaust the catalogue, for the purpose of showing that the modern gospel of "free competition" with its commercial system based upon selfishness, and the Gospel of our Lord, based upon charity, are utterly irreconcilable. Even Carlyle, nearly fifty years ago, apprehended and illustrated their truth. And yet this antagonistic sys-

tem of "free competition" has dominated the English-speaking people for two centuries or more, and constitutes the very essence of our so-called civilization, with its unjust accumulation of enormous fortunes and the realization of splendid ut corrupting luxury by the few, and its rapidly increasing pauperism and squalid misery on the part of the many. Matthew Arnold, depicting the effects of this civilization in England, declared in these sad words, that by it "the higher class has become materialized, the middle class vulgarized, and the lower class brutalized!" And I add that not only has it succeeded in subordinating all forms of Protestant Christianity, but its spirit of intense worldliness has so saturated the English-speaking Catholic people that multitudes of them join in the insane scramble for wealth — some of them even dabbling in "corners" and dealing in "futures" on 'change, and, in the coldness of their charity neglecting the care of the poor in their own parishes.

And thus, in view of the all-pervading and insidious influences that surround and hedge us in on all sides—in our schools and systems of education; in our politics, commerce, and trade; and above all, in our agnostic publications and in our depraved works of art and floating literature, which are so inexpressibly enticing and corrupting—it is a grave and serious question whether our environment, and especially that of our young men, whether rich or poor, is not more difficult and more dangerous than that of the early Christians in the corrupt Roman empire.

"Verily," cried Carlyle over forty years ago—and the condition of things has grown vastly worse since then—"at no time since the beginning of society was the lot of the dumb millions of toilers so utterly unbearable as it is even in the days now passing over us. It is not to die, or even to die of hunger, that makes a man wretched; but to live miserable, we know not why; to work sore and yet gain nothing; to be * * * isolated, unrelated, girt with a cold, universal *laissez faire!*" "Truly, an enchantment of the evil one!"

Now the question is how to get out of that horrible enchantment, how to reconstruct and rehabilitate a societary condition which shall embrace *all* the people, as of old, and give every human being at least an *opportunity* to do and to be what he should do and should be? Is this a Utopian vision? Is it an impossible though fascinating scheme? Let us not forget that the very object of our Lord's mission to this earth was to enable us to overcome the wretched consequences of man's disobedience, and to build up spiritual and temporal societies to be the peaceful homes of all mankind.

Thank God, there are to-day some signs of improvement, some grounds of hope for a betterment of our condition. For is it not indeed a hopeful sign that on every side strenuous efforts are making, on the part of those who suffer and those who sympathize with them, to stop the process of disintegration resulting from unrestrained competition, and to recommence the process of recombining the isolated particles in a consolidated union, coöperating harmoniously once more on the primordial principle of the brotherhood of man?

Under the influence of the modern gospel, men were slow in

learning that selfishness never can be a permanent bond of union, but always must be a powerful, almost irresistible, force tending to disunion and disruption. But the reaction came at last. Beginning some forty or fifty years ago with the trades unions in England, which had to fight their way inch by inch against the purse-proud and bull-dog conservatism of the English plutocracy, and following along with the coöperative societies, the mutual aid associations, the Rochedale unions, the labor unions, the profit-sharing enterprises, and the altogether praiseworthy manufacturing establishments in France, Belgium, England, and this country—alas! too few -organized by just-minded and whole-souled men so as to promote and secure the highest interests of every workman and his family, we come down at last to the powerful organization of the Knights of Labor of the present day.

But it is not within the scope of my design now to inquire into the details, the merits, or defects of these various organizations. All honor to the good ones, and success to their judicious endeavors! It is truly a pleasure to note that one "result of this great labor movement," as Mr. Ely said,* "is a grander conception of brotherhood. When the members of labor organizations call one another brother and sister it means something, and every day it is coming to mean more, as those know who look a little below the surface of things, and study men with half the care with which natural phenomena are examined. Association is of inestimable benefit to men. It is one of Henry C. Carey's merits as a political economist that he brought out so clearly the great truth that 'Man is by nature a social being;' "—a teaching, I may add, so different from, and so much more humane and noble than the teaching of that hard, godless political economy which treats the laborer as a mere machine, hardly on a level with the beasts that perish.

But however admirable may be this prevailing tendency towards association and coöperation, and however much to be encouraged this growing feeling of brotherhood, it is to be noted that all these movements are simply voluntary associations, partial and limited, not state organizations embracing all parts of human society. True, there may be some efforts tending in the same direction on the part of some states. Thus there is Bismarck's famous scheme by which the government takes the monopoly of manufacturing tobacco, and uses the income from the business as a basis for a fund for the insurance of men working in the factories against accident or inability to work from old age — the income of the monopoly being called the patrimony of the poor. Tending in the same direction is the state control of railroads in France, state control of telegraph lines, tenement houses, and tenant-rights to land in Great Britain and Ireland, and the agitation for state control of railroad and telegraph lines, and state resumption of the ownership of land and the taxation of land values in this country.

But the point I wish to make now is this: That neither one of these schemes, nor all of them put together, can work out a solu-

* *Forum*, March, 1887.

tion of the complicated social problems that perplex this age. For, after all, they are, as I said, only partial remedies. No doubt the associations bring great helps to all who are members, and who can manage by good health and strength to hold their membership. But they by no means include and provide for the vast numbers who are not members—that is to say, for *all* the people, as did the primitive plan of human society when launched by the all-wise Creator upon the principle of the brotherhood of man. At the very highest estimate are not all these organizations and state efforts mainly intended to advance merely the temporal and material interests of men? They may be cunningly devised to reconcile those interests; but they, as well as the brilliant schemes for state assumption of all industrial enterprises and public establishments so beautifully elucidated by Edward Bellamy in his fascinating book, "Looking Backward," must fail to accomplish the great end of human society simply because they do not embody or make place for the divine principle of charity. "For all these things," said our Lord, "do the *heathen* seek." Humanity cannot be saved by heathenism. The highest good of human society, by the order of its divine Creator, depends upon the harmony of the natural order with the supernatural order. Dr. Brownson demonstrated, forty years ago, in his profound criticisms of the fascinating theories of Owen, Fourier, Saint-Simon, Cabet, Leroux, and other socialists, that if the supreme good of society is sought for on the assumption that that good lies in the *natural* order alone, and that the supernatural order is a myth, and therefore to be ignored and unheeded, then, however numerous and powerful may be your merely humane, philanthropic, and coöperative measures, yet the final end of it all must be inevitable failure.

Helen Campbell proclaimed that there could be no mitigation of pauperism until "the whole system of modern thought is reconstructed, and we come to some sense of what the eternal verities really are." True enough! But need I add that only the Catholic Church can teach those "eternal verities"?—that she alone can solve the problems that are worrying the souls of men? For she alone has the light that can enlighten our darkness. She alone has the word suited to our condition, and what more we need is to have that word given to the hungry millions who are waiting and gasping for the Bread of Life.

Who has forgotten that vast crowds of enthusiastic men and women not long ago imagined that the hoped-for messenger had appeared in Henry George or Dr. McGlynn? It was wonderful to see the depth and earnestness of feeling exhibited by those people. So also was it pitiful to witness their sore disappointment.

But in this trying crisis we are not left without leaders. Thank God! the judicious, earnest, and sympathizing efforts of Cardinal Gibbons at Rome in behalf of the Knights of Labor and the cause of freedom in our glorious country, and the magnificent triumph of Cardinal Manning in his recent grand work of reconciling the rich and haughty dock owners and the poor laborers in London, have lifted up the hearts and hopes of the waiting and despairing millions.

The universal outburst of popular admiration which greeted these great efforts demonstrates, I believe, that the field is ripe for the harvest—that the people are in a condition to receive the word which Catholic leaders ought to be able to deliver. St. Philip Neri said: "Give me even ten truly detached men and I will convert the world." If only we could see Cardinal Manning and Cardinal Gibbons joined by even ten more equally detached, self-denying, humble, brave, well equipped, eloquent, and pure-minded men, how soon would our eyes be gladdened by seeing them carry the world before them!

While we are waiting for this heroic, self-denying band to step forth as leaders in this righteous crusade, let every Catholic remember that he too, can join in a crusade, and can readily find a field for the exercise of a heroic self-denial and love of his neighbor among the people of his own parish, where, under judicious guidance, the brethren could be led on to work wonders by driving out pauperism and making the parish a model Christian society, of which people would say once more, as of old: "Behold, how these Christians love one another!"

"Impossible!" do you say? Would you then dissolve the God-man and become worse than an infidel? Do you hold that the glorious Christian ideals on which Christendom was so wonderfully formed by the saints and doctors and philosophers and artists during 1,400 years, have vanished never to return? God forbid, and help up us to realize those ideals once more.

"Restore," said the Holy Father,* "that social edifice so patiently reared by the church in other ages, and let it be strengthened by listening once more to the teaching of the church. * * * I wish that, by a sincere *return* to Christian principles, men should endeavor to restore, to secure between employers and workmen, between capital and labor, the harmony and union which can alone guarantee the interests of both, and alone contribute to the private welfare of all."

WHAT CATHOLICS HAVE DONE IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

TWELFTH REGULAR PAPER, BY RICHARD H. CLARKE, LL.D., OF NEW YORK CITY.

It is a spectacle as pleasing to heaven as it is of deep interest to men, the Catholics of the United States, by their representatives assembled in congress, this year of grace, the centenary of the hierarchy, to review the history of the past hundred years, to consider the present status with its duties, and the future with its hopes. It is not in our civil or political character as citizens, it is not as representatives of the learned professions, or of art, science, commerce, or labor, but we are assembled as Christians; as members of the Cath-

*Address to the French workingmen, Sunday, October 20. 1889.

olic Church, a church which has faithfully taught the generations of nineteen centuries their relations to God, their neighbors, and themselves, and has led those generations with honor to the grave. While treating the subject historically, I shall avoid dry details. We must consider our position in this western world at the discovery, at the erection of the first episcopal see in 1789, and at the present moment, and consider what light is thus thrown upon the duties and the prospects of the future. What have we accomplished for our religion and our country? Have we done our whole duty? How can we accomplish more and better things in the coming century?

At the time of the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492, the most important aspect of the situation was not so much the discovery of a continent as the coming of the Christian races of Europe face to face with new and unknown races of their fellowmen — savages, it is true, but endowed with souls after the image of the one true God. In 1789, when the republic had sprung into life and action, and the church was organized, we, as a religious body, stood face to face with relations and duties to the Indians, to the colored population, to our Protestant fellow-citizens constituting the great mass of the American prople, and to ourselves.

Our centenary is that of the erection of the see of Baltimore, and the appointment of the first bishop by the papal bulls, dated November 6, 1789, and not that of the consecration of Bishop Carroll, which took place at Lulworth Castle, at the invitation of Thomas Weld, Esq., a zealous Catholic layman, in England, August 15, 1790. Our first bishop received consecration from the hands of Rt. Rev. Charles Walmesley, bishop of Rama, *in partibus*, and vicar apostolic of London. A brief retrospective glance at Catholic history from this auspicious event through our colonial period is necessary; but in a paper unavoidably restricted in length, as this is, I am compelled to condense whole chapters of history into sentences, even into words.

Our progress now seems to me but the recovery of a field which was originally our own. Catholic Northmen were the first Christians to land on our shores, and as early as the tenth century down to the beginning of the fifteenth, the western continent had her Catholic churches, cathedrals, and a succession of seventeen or eighteen bishops, and our own shores were visited by a Catholic bishop and priests, and the cross planted in our soil. The Vinland of the Northmen is now recognized by scholars as having been located in Rhode Island, near Newport, and there Bishop Eric gave his life for the faith in the twelfth century.

The discovery of America by Columbus was distinctively a Catholic event, and the Cabots, John and Sebastian, in 1498, explored our northern Atlantic coast, were accompanied, as is well known, by a priest from Bristol, Eng., and Mass was then said within our territories. Again our soil was consecrated to Catholicity in 1512 under Ponce De Leon in Florida. The discovery of the Pacific Ocean in 1513 by Balboa, of the Gulf of Mexico by Garay in 1524, the crossing of the continent by De Vaca in 1532, the discov-

ery of Canada by Cartier in 1534, of the Mississippi by De Soto in 1541, the advent of the Spaniards to New Mexico under Coronado in 1542, the building of St. Augustine in 1564, the first Mass in California in 1601, Champlain's discovery of Penobscot Bay in 1604, of Lake Champlain in 1609, and of Lake Ontario in 1615, and, above all, the arrival of the Catholic colony of Maryland from England in 1634 are only a few of the events, Catholic in origin, motive, and history, which have given our religion the historic precedence here over all others. The early Indian Catholic missions, with their good results in converting thousands of pagans to Christianity, the labors, travels, sufferings, persecutions, and martyrdoms of saintly missionaries form a chapter of surpassing heroism and grandeur in American Catholic history. We may attribute the unparalleled growth of Catholicity during the closing century in part to the blood of martyrs so generously poured forth on our soil.

Though not included in my subject, I cannot refrain from making a passing mention of the patriotic services rendered by Catholics in our revolutionary struggle. While other religious bodies were either against us or were largely divided, Catholics were united with singular compactness in favor of American independence and the war for its attainment. The American armies swarmed with Catholic soldiers. The names of Moylan, Doyle, McGuire, Vigo, Charlevoix, Gosselin, Guillot, La Balme, Loiseau, and of the Indian chief, Orono, who held a continental commission, should be honorably mentioned. While Canada, as a whole, was secured against us, the list I give shows how great was individual sympathy for us in Canada. Catholic France and Spain rendered us services indispensable to our success. Commodore John Barry, by his gallantry, skill, and victories, laid the foundations of the American navy. In the Continental Congress sat Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, Daniel Carroll, Thomas Fitzsimmons, and John Sim Lee Carroll, of Carrollton, was a member of the board of war and a United States senator. Thomas Fitzsimmons and Daniel Carroll were members of the convention that framed the constitution. Thomas Fitzsimmons and George Meade, grandfather of the hero of Gettysburg, also rendered important military services. The mission of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and Rev. Dr. Carroll, in company with Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Chase, to Canada, at the request of congress, was in keeping with the unfailing readiness of Catholics from that day to this to serve their country.

Prior to, and at the outbreak of the revolution, the Catholic cause was greatly depressed. Protestant England had triumphed over Catholic France in America, the Indian missions were either crushed or jeopardized, Catholic Canada not only belonged to England, but her sympathies also had been gained against us by the adroit policy of England, a just policy in itself, by securing to the Canadians the free exercise of their religion by the celebrated Quebec Act. The action and declarations of congress, hostile at once to our faith and to the religious freedom guaranteed to Canada by that act, were unfortunate in principle and in effect. The Society of Jesus, of which the American clergy were members, had

been suppressed, and most of the states discriminated against Catholics in their constitutions and laws.

But after the adoption of the constitution, the inauguration of Washington as first president, and the consecration of Dr. Carroll as first Catholic bishop, the tide was changed, and our first century of unprecedented growth and Catholic progress was inaugurated under bright auspices in 1789. Catholics came out of the war with an honorable record. The struggle for independence had educated the American people in favor of religious liberty. Washington at Boston on November 5, 1774, had given the death blow to an annual celebration, insulting to Catholics, and known as "The Pope's Day," and the celebration of "Guy Fawkes' Day" in other parts of New England ceased with it. Laws discriminating against Catholics had disappeared from the statute books of most of the states, and Catholics now enjoyed freedom of worship everywhere. The two clauses of the constitution, one providing that, "Congress shall not require any religious test as a qualification for office under the United States," and the other providing that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or forbidding the free exercise thereof," exerted a wonderful moral effect on the states which still reserved such powers to themselves. This constitutional provision was and still is imperfect — it would have been complete had these powers, thus forbidden to congress, been also prohibited to the states. Catholics wisely refrained from agitating this subject publicly, while they ardently favored the clause; and it would not seem from historical data, that they presented any petition to congress or the convention on the subject, as some have supposed. Archbishop Carroll thought, and with good reasons, no doubt, that this clause was actuated partly by deference and respect for Catholics — the states, in most of which one or another sect predominated, adopted the amendment, as there is good historical basis for believing, as a security to their own sects against a possible majority in congress against them. But as a matter of constitutional law, congress could not have exercised such a power, even without that clause, for it is expressly provided in the constitution that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." The effect of the clause is chiefly a moral one, and has done good service as such.

The patriotism and loyalty of Catholics have frequently been attested. The address of the Catholics to Washington, in March, 1790, is not surpassed by any manifestation of patriotism in our history as a nation. It was signed by Bishop Carroll, and by four laymen, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton; Daniel Carroll, Dominick Lynch, and Thomas Fitzsimmons. It drew from Washington, whose whole life manifests a sincere regard for Catholics, a tribute to the patriotic part which they took in the accomplishment of the revolution and the establishment of our government.

Not only in the war of the revolution, but in all the subsequent wars, the American armies have swarmed with Catholic soldiers. Prior to the revolution Catholics had not been permitted by the states

to hold commissions as officers in the state militia, and it is wonderful, under such circumstances, that so many officers as I have named were found with experience or military training to win such honored fame as did the Catholic officers in the revolution. But in all our subsequent wars the Catholic body has been as eminent for the services of accomplished officers as for the numbers of Catholic soldiers, as is witnessed by a long succession of gallant and skilful Catholic officers in every service; an honored list, terminating with the name of one upon whom, before his recent death, a grateful country conferred the highest honors of the army—General Sheridan.

In the war of 1812, the noblest outburst of patriotism took place, when the Catholics of New Orleans, headed by their bishop, Dr. Dubourg, welcomed back to the city, and in their cathedral honored General Jackson, the victorious hero of the decisive battle of New Orleans. One of the handsomest acts of patriotism in our history occurred, when the American government, in the Mexican war, asked through Archbishop Hughes for two Catholic chaplains to accompany the armies to the seat of war. The Society of Jesus immediately gave two of its most distinguished members for this service, Fathers Ray and McElroy; the former soon gave his life for his country, and the latter rendered long and faithful services, and was frequently and honorably mentioned in the military dispatches from the advancing armies. In our civil war, Catholics, without the slightest breach in their unity of faith and worship, are acknowledged on both sides to have been distinguished for the civil and military services they rendered. Three Catholic bishops, Bishop Lynch, from the south, and Archbishop Hughes and Bishop Domenec, from the north, performed confidential missions to European powers; and it is quite certain that Archbishop Hughes succeeded in preventing France from intervening in the struggle, and that Bishop Domenec rendered the same service to the Union in Spain.

Loyalty, both spiritual and political, is a Catholic virtue. The services rendered by Catholics in peace and war, in senate and cabinet, prove the one, and the devotion and support of Catholics towards the Holy See attest the other. A Catholic who is true to his faith and to the moral code of his church, cannot be faithless to any civil duty, cannot be a traitor to his country. Perfect harmony exists between his political and his spiritual loyalty. While manifesting their devotion to country in every branch of service, and rejoicing in our triumph over British armies that had invaded our soil, the Catholics of America celebrated in 1814 with *Te Deum* in their churches the liberation of Pope Pius VII from his imprisonment by Napoleon I, and no Catholics in the world have shown such resentment at the Italian seisure of the papal states, and the outrages inflicted upon those illustrious popes, Pius IX and Leo XIII. Those pontiffs have rewarded the Catholics of America by bestowing the highest honors of the papal senate, and two eminent divines, conscious of their fidelity to their country, accepted the exalted position of princes of the church. Who is there that could dare to question the patriotism or loyalty of two such citizens as Cardinal McCloskey or Cardinal Gibbons?

Scarcely had the first bishop been consecrated in 1790, when the Catholic body throughout the land gained new life, and showed evidences of that immense energy which has given us the unparalleled growth of the century. Applications for pastors came to Bishop Carroll from his flocks in every part, including the Indians of Maine, remnants of the devoted fold of the martyred Father Rale. The examples of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, at Baltimore, and of Daniel Carroll, of Duddington, at Washington, in giving church sites, were followed in many places by zealous laymen. In 1790, Father Thayer, our earliest convert, challenged inquiry into Catholic faith and morals in his native city of Boston, and conversions followed. In 1791 the Sulpitians arrived in Baltimore, became the educators of the rising clergy at St. Mary's College, and now various dioceses are entrusting them with the same exalted duty. The political troubles of Europe providentially sent us a noble body of French clergy, such missionaries as Flaget, Dubourg, Dubois, David, and Chicoisneau, followed by the arrival of the Abbés Levadoux, Richard, Ciquard, Matignon, Bruté, Cheverus, and many others. Illustrious bishops have sprung from this source.

The diocese of Baltimore embraced the whole United States, with the territories east of the Mississippi, but at the north and south were territories either within the disputed northwestern boundaries, or the extensive region of Louisiana or the Floridas, then subject to either Spanish or French bishops, which subsequently were added to the American church. The number of churches in the country, in 1789, was about thirty. With unequalled energy and generosity this small number has within the last 100 years been increased to about 7,500 churches. Georgetown College was founded by Bishop Carroll, in 1789; it was our only college, and such illustrious citizens as Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, Thomas Fitzsimmons and Dominick Lynch, were among those who undertook to collect and receive donations for the institution. In the last 100 years we have established about 100 colleges and universities. To crown the great work thus represented by such institutions as the universities of Georgetown and Nôtre Dame, the Catholics of America have just founded the American Catholic university at Washington, which solemnly opened this week. When Georgetown College was founded, a century ago, a donation of $100 was justly then regarded as munificent; now, such has been the well merited success of Catholic industry and integrity in worldly pursuits, that we behold the subscription list of the new university headed with a single donation from a lady, of $300,000. Many other munificent donations have been received, and, no doubt, will be honorably acknowledged in due season.

A hundred years ago there was not a Catholic orphan asylum or hospital in the land; now we have about 500 asylums and hospitals; also homes for the aged and helpless of every condition, industrial and reform schools, retreats for every form of misfortune, of which there was not one in 1789, and which are now counted by hundreds. There was not a single female academy at the beginning; ten years ago, in 1878, it was estimated that we had 525; the num-

ber is now probably 700. Ecclesiastical institutions have increased from one in 1790 to thirty-three in 1878; now the probable number is fifty. In 1789 the number of our churches was scarcely twenty, in 1810 we had eighty churches, in 1820 one hundred and ten, in 1830 two hundred and thirty, in 1840 four hundred and fifty-four, in 1850 eleven hundred, in 1860 two thousand three hundred and eighty-five, in 1878 five thousand seven hundred and twenty, and in 1889 probably seven thousand five hundred churches. In 1789 we had one college, in 1800 we had two, in 1810 three, in 1820 five, in 1830 six, in 1840 nine, in 1850 seventeen, in 1860 thirty-four, in 1878 seventy-seven, in 1889 nearly one hundred.

The increase of colleges, universities, and female academies does not show a tithe of what Catholics have done for education, which in all the world has no such friend as the Catholic Church. It is the free schools for the education of the people that show where we stand, as friends of popular education. The Catholic free school is traced back to very early times in this country. In the early part of the century not only Catholics, but also Presbyterians, Episcopalians and other sects had schools of their respective creeds, and we started out generally, as far as schools existed, espousing the denominational school system, which is based upon the principle that it is better for Christians of every creed to educate their children in their respective forms of Christianity, than to educate them with total indifference to religion, which is but little removed from paganism. Catholics have adhered to this, while the sects have abandoned it for the common schools. The Catholic schools increased, though slowly at first, while Protestant schools decreased, being merged in the public schools, which grew to be a national feature. By collecting an enforced tax from Catholics, for the support of schools without religion, and to which they cannot send their children, conscience is trampled upon. We know that many Catholics are unfortunately in such schools—we cannot conscientiously send our children to them, nor can we maintain such schools as temptations for other Catholic children to attend. We are not opposed to the public schools as such, but we cannot avail ourselves of them, and the accusation that Catholics would destroy or get control of them is utterly destitute of truth. We simply claim that our own money, intended for the education of our children *in the public schools*, be applied to the support of our own free schools founded for the education of our own children. Who can doubt the integrity of our convictions, when they see that, after paying our quota to support the public schools, we have erected and now maintain nearly 3,250 Catholic free schools, attended by about 600,000 pupils? This grand showing is mainly the work of only a third of a century. So rapidly has this great work been accomplished that we may hope that the next ten years will see parochial schools sufficient for all the Catholic children in America, and every Catholic child in America attending a Catholic school.

According to the principles of political economy, the greatest service that can be rendered to a nation is to increase its industrial and producing population. Under this head we can claim pre-

eminence over every other element of national population. And as we make this review, one can but be convinced that our Catholic schools are inadequate for the Catholic population of the country, and that the imperative duty of providing schools presses us on every side. Estimates, probably below the truth, inform us that the Catholics in the United States in 1776 were 25,000, or 1-120 of the entire population; in 1790 we had 30,000 (more probably 32,000), or 1-107; in 1800 we had 100,000, or 1-53; in 1810 we had 150,000, or 1-48; in 1820 we had 300,000, or 1-32; in 1830 we had 600,000, or 1-21; in 1840 we had 1,500,000, or 1-11; in 1850 we had 3,500,000, or 1-7; in 1860 we had 4,500,000, or 1-7; and in 1878 we had 7,000,000, or 1-6; and now in 1889 we have 10,000,000 or 1-5 of the entire population of the United States.

The expansion of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States is a majestic spectacle. In 1789 we had a vicar apostolic, who was bishop-elect, and was consecrated on August 15, 1790. To-day the American Catholic hierarchy numbers thirteen archbishops and seventy-five bishops, including one coadjutor and the five newly appointed bishops. The thirty priests of 1789 have been increased to nearly 8,000 and 1,500 young Levites preparing for the priesthood. In 1840 we had but one archbishop, in 1850 we had six, in 1860 we had seven, in 1878 eleven, and in 1889 thirteen. In 1810 we had five bishops, in 1820 we had six, in 1830 we had nine, in 1840 we had sixteen, in 1850 we had twenty-seven, in 1860 we had forty-two and in 1878 fifty-seven. There are also seven mitred abbots, heads of religious communities, and these are but suggestive of the zealous and heroic religious orders and congregations of men and women counting many thousands, doing the work of heaven on earth. In 1808 the episcopal sees of Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Bardstown were erected, and Baltimore became a metropolitan see; now we have thirteen ecclesiastical provinces and metropolitan sees. The hierarchy of archbishops, bishops, prelates, theologians, priests and officers has assembled three times at Baltimore in plenary councils, in 1852 under the presidency of Archbishop Kenrick, in 1866 under Archbishop Spalding and in 1884 under Archbishop Gibbons. In addition to these plenary councils, numerous provincial councils and diocesan synods have been held. A mass of legislation of the wisest kind has been enacted for the government of the church, which has elicited admiration at Rome. American bishops have rendered signal services in the ecumenical council of the Vatican and at other Roman consultations. The loyalty of the laity has been well exemplified by their devout acceptance of the definitions of the dogmas of the immaculate conception and of papal infallibility, and in their docile support of the decrees of the American councils. Two American Catholic pilgrimages have occurred in the last fifteen years, the first in 1874 to Rome and to the Grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes, the second in 1889 to Rome and the Holy Land.

Two golden events in our history must be mentioned. In 1815, an American bishop, Rt. Rev. William Dubourg, of Louisiana, founded at Lyons in France, while seeking aid for his vast diocese, the noble and illustrious "Association for the Propagation of the

Faith"; an organization which has sent the faith into many lands. In 1829, Rev. Frederick Résé, afterwards first bishop of Detroit, founded at Vienna the Leopoldine Association, which had for its exalted object the support and assistance of the American missions.

The accumulation of property for religious, educational, and charitable purposes has kept pace necessarily with the increase of the hierarchy and of the Catholic population. The Catholic Church property in the United States is not wealth, as it is termed by the reports of the census. Now immense as this accumulation seems in figures, as long as there are not churches enough to accommodate the Catholic population at divine service, nor school-houses for Catholic children, and a struggle for existence is going on in so many dioceses, parishes, and institutions, wealth cannot be an element of the status; for wealth is accumulated, or surplus, capital. I refer to the figures supplied by the Census Bureau as demonstrative of a healthy and continuous growth in the exalted mission of Christianity. The value of the entire property of the United States in 1850 was $7,135,780,228, in 1860, $16,159,616,668; in 1870, $30,668,518,507. The increase from 1850 to 1860 was about 125 per cent, and from 1860 to 1870 it was 86 per cent. The value of the Catholic Church property in 1850 was $9,256,758; in 1860 it was $26,794,119; in 1870 it was $60,985,565. The increase from 1850 to 1860 was about 189 per cent, and from 1860 to 1870 it was 128 per cent. So that while the increase in the national property during the first two decades named was 125 per cent, the increase in Catholic Church property was 189 per cent; and in the second decade the wealth of the nation increased 86 per cent; that of the Catholic Church gained 128 per cent.

I had intended, but must from want of space and time refrain from giving the history of the various nationalities that go to form our Catholic population, and the sources of our great increase, the principal of which is immigration. Some idea can be formed, though inadequately, of the immensity of Catholic immigration from the fact that during the thirty years prior to 1876, the Irish immigration alone was 2,001,727. German Catholic immigration comes next in numbers. But the subject is too vast. Among the lessons of this history can be profitably mentioned that the Catholic Church embraces all nations, but it is of no nation. One of the best services Catholics can render to their church and their country is to give all their energies to the great work of uniting all nationalities into one harmonious whole; and let it be their highest ambition to be at once Catholics and Americans.

Catholics have gained largely by conversions from Protestantism from the time Father Thayer returned as a Catholic priest to his native city of Boston in 1790 to the present time; but the fifty years from 1825 to 1875 was the period of most conversions; and the two extremes—Episcopalianism and Unitarianism—have been the principal sources of conversions. Scarcely an American family of eminence is without its Catholic converts, from the conversion of Miss Fanny Allen, daughter of Gen. Ethan Allen, in 1807, to the more recent conversion of a daughter of Gen. Winfield Scott, in our day.

A list of prominent converts lately published contains nearly 700 names. Fuller statistics might have swelled the number to probably 2,000. Among our converts were Archbishops Eccleston, Bayley, and Wood, and Bishops Tyler, Young, Rosecranz, Gilmour, Becker, Wadhams, and Curtis, besides members of the clergy too numerous to be named. Four converts—Mrs. Seton, Mrs. Connolly, Mrs. Starr and Father Hecker—have rendered eminent services to religion and charity by founding religious communities. From casual reports it is evident that conversions have been numerous. In 1853 Archbishop Hughes confirmed 236 persons in New York, of whom thirty-six were converts. Out of sixty-five confirmed on one occasion in Ohio nine were converts. Archbishop Henni, of Milwaukee, confirmed on one day 150, of whom twenty-two were converts. Archbishop Kenrick, of Baltimore, confirmed once 154, of whom twenty-five were converts. During a period of five years Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore, confirmed 22,209 persons, of whom 2,752 were converts. We have an account of an entire congregation in North Carolina composed of converts. In some dioceses the proportion of converts among those confirmed is placed at five per cent; in others at seven per cent; and in others as high as twelve per cent. American converts have rendered eminent services to religion, education, and charity, and have been distinguished as writers in theology, history, fiction, and spirituality. Would that I could name them all. Among our converts was Hon. Thomas Sim Lee, a revolutionary patriot, a friend of Washington, and member of the Continental Congress. A remarkable conversion was that of the first Protestant bishop who became reconciled to the church since the Reformation, Dr. Levi Silliman Ives, who laid his episcopal ring at the feet of Pope Pius IX. Devoting himself to Catholic works, Dr. Ives crowned his noble career by founding the New York Catholic Protectory, which in its past and present admirable management, and in the number of children of both sexes it has restored to good citizenship and to religious lives, has scarcely an equal, and has served as the model of similar institutions in other dioceses. Preëminent among Catholic converts, for his great learning and powerful intellect, his child-like faith, his championship of the truth, his command of the purest and strongest English, and his voluminous and matchless writings, stands the name of Orestes A. Brownson. Eulogy is silenced before so great a man. The Catholics of America will show their gratitude and admiration by sustaining the movement for erecting a statue in Central Park to this illustrious Catholic.

Catholics have made a brave struggle to carry and sustain Christianity among the Indians, for whose salvation so many early Catholic missionaries heroically labored and gave their lives. At the consecration of Bishop Carroll, in 1790, the Indian missions, for which such treasures of zeal and blood had been spent, were almost wholly suspended or destroyed; but that noble prelate recommenced the apostolic work, and under Washington's administration secured from the government the appointment of a Catholic chaplain for Catholic Indians. He revived the Indian missions in Maine and

other parts, and what he commenced was carried forward in our day by successive prelates and priests, prominent among whom were Bishops Miège, in the Indian Territory, Baraga, in Michigan, and Blanchet and Seghers, in Oregon and Alaska, and Father De Smet, in the Rocky Mountains. Recognized by our government as nations with whom treaties are made, the Indians are treated as subjects under the designation of wards of the nation, and not as freemen. Religious liberty is not one of the rights accorded to them. Under General Grant's administration the tribes were parcelled out for religious and educational service among various religious bodies, and we then saw Catholic Indians assigned to non-Catholic ministers and teachers. The present administration is apparently on the eve of discontinuing this arrangement by adopting a worse system, that of governmental free schools, from which, no doubt, all Christianity will be excluded.

The Catholic colored people have shared also the solicitude of mother church. The priests of St. Joseph founded in England, in 1867, sent their first missionaries to America in 1871. I regret that I cannot give in detail this interesting chapter in the Catholic history of our country. But the work is going on—churches for colored people have been provided in Baltimore, Washington, Charleston, New York, and other cities, and the plan of training priests of their own color has been inaugurated. A Catholic bureau of Indian missions was founded at Washington in 1874, and a commission for the Catholic missions among the Indians and colored people has been established at Baltimore, and charged with the distribution of the annual collections taken up in all the churches by order of the third plenary council.

The growth of church property in the United States has kept pace with the improved condition of Catholics in temporal prosperity. The struggles of our population for life and success in the most active competition, perhaps, in the history of our race, accounted probably for the absence, in the past, of generous endowments of churches and institutions. But that feature of Catholic life is now passing away, for the Catholic body now numbers its millionaires, and munificence is now becoming a Catholic virtue in America. Not only have we witnessed the princely generosity of Catholics to their university, but I could mention other cases of Catholic munificence, now crowning the century's work of the poor who, by their small, but frequent gifts, have heretofore built our churches and institutions of education and charity. In New York diocese a lady is building a splendid church entirely at her own expense. In the diocese of Philadelphia, Mr. Cahill devoted nearly $500,000 to works of charity. Mr. Francis A. Drexell gave by his will to the institutions of the same diocese, the munificent sum of $1,500,000, and since his death the industrial school at Eddington, Bucks county, has been founded by a daughter of Mr. Drexell, at an expense of $800,000, while another daugeter has expended on the Indian churches and schools in the Indian reservations, in a single year, nearly $100,000. Similar acts of munificence have been done in other dioceses — but so far Philadelphia is

the banner diocese. A great work of distinctively Catholic charity is carried on in nearly every diocese by Catholic laymen in the society of St. Vincent de Paul, of which there are many hundred conferences, improving and relieving the moral and temporal condition of the poor, without distinction of creed.

The church in America has produced a rich literature, and many distinguished scholars and authors. C. Talbot, 1784, was the first publisher of Catholic books. Bernand Dornin, of New York, 1805–9, was the first exclusively Catholic publisher, and Matthew Carey, 1789–1839, was so eminent as publisher and writer that Father Finotti, in his Bibliographia Catholica Americana, applied to him the language, "A printer, a bookseller, a poet, a writer and publicist, an editor, a philanthropist, and a patriot." From that time to 1866, when Father Hecker founded the Catholic Publication Society, and to the present, Catholic publication has grown into a vast and permanent business.

Many learned and elegant writers have graced our literature. I should mention Rev. Charles Constantine Pise, novelist and poet; Father Fredet, author of school histories; James McSherry, historian of Maryland; John Augustus Shea, poet; Robert Walsh, essayist; Bishop England, grand in his miscellaneous writings on Catholic subjects; Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan and Bernard U. Campbell, historians; Archbishop Spalding, author of historical and miscellaneous works; Archbishop Bayley, historical writer; Father De Smet, missionary and historian of missions; James F. Meline, author of history and fiction; Rev. Charles I. White, biographer of Mother Seton; Gayarré, historian of Louisiana; Rev. Joseph F. Finotti, Catholic bibliographer; Fathers Hecker and Hewit, authors of spiritual works; Rev. James Kent Stone, author of "The Invitation Heeded;" John R. G. Hassard, historian and journalist; James A. McMaster, Patrick Valentine Hickey and Mr. Barr, of Pittsburgh, eminent as journalists. In fiction we have Dr. Bryant, Dr. J. V. Huntington, Rev. B. J. O'Reilly, Rev. Donald X. McLeod. In fiction and drama, George H. Miles, and in general literature, Maurice Francis Egan.

Among dogmatic, theological, and spiritual writers, Archbishop Kenrick, of Baltimore, has produced standard theological and scriptural works of high authority, and in this department we have such writers as Father Hecker, Hewit, McLeod, Preston, Walworth, Weninger, James Kent Stone, Father Thebaud, and the popular and useful works of Cardinal Gibbons. As a reviewer, Dr. Brownson stands preëminent, and as a Catholic historian and scholar the first place is deservedly accorded to our learned and distinguished contemporary, Dr. John Gilmary Shea. Among the ablest essayists of our times, I should mention Bishops Lynch and Becker, Father Thebaud, and Dr. James A. Corcoran. In poetry we can mention Abbé Rouquette, of New Orleans, Father Ryan of Virginia, John Savage and John Boyle O'Reilly; in astronomy, Father Curley, late of Georgetown College; in military engineering, Generals Charles P. Stone and John Newton; in mathematics, Father Sestini, S. J.; in architecture, Patrick Keilly, of Brooklyn, and in oratory,

Bishop England, of Charleston, Archbishop Hughes, of New York, and Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia.

Justice requires that separate and special mention should be made of the noble work done in America by Catholic women. Here I would mention Grace Newton Simpson, of Kentucky, who, in 1809–36, so ably explained Catholic tenets as to lead many converts to the church. Mrs. Sarah Peter, of Ohio, stands out preëminent among American women for her noble works of charity and philanthropy. She was a convert to our faith. She devoted her wealth and her life to the highest purposes. In 1850 she founded the School of Design for women in Philadelphia; in 1853 she established a Ladies' Academy of Art at Cincinnati, for which she purchased costly pictures and statuary in Europe; in Cincinnati she founded several sisterhoods, and several convents in Philadelphia. She was honored by Pius IX, to whom she paid several special visits in the interests of her works. Mrs. General Sherman won honors at home and from Rome for her heroic labors in behalf of the Indians. Among Catholic authors I should name Mrs. Anna H. Dorsey, Mrs. Mary A. Sadlier, Miss Mary A. Hoffman, Miss M. A. Tinker, Miss Eleanor C. Donnelly Madame Le Vert, of Alabama, Mrs. Sarah M. Brownson Tenney, daughter of the illustrious Dr. Brownson, Miss Hemmenway, Mrs. Elizabeth F. Ellet, who published several learned and authentic histories of the revolutionary period, and Miss Eliza Allen Starr, author of the beautiful volumes on "Pilgrims and Shrines" and on "Patron Saints," but yet more distinguished as the most accomplished lecturer in America on Christian art, the first lady to whom was awarded the Laetare medal by the university of Nôtre Dame.

I cannot close this hurried paper without a brief word on Catholic losses and needs, perhaps the most instructive part of our history. Catholic populations coming from Europe to America have been much exposed to the loss of their faith. The losses from this source have been immeasurably greater than the gains from conversions, and some have thought that we have lost more than half of our immigrant population or their descendants. In fact, the Catholic body has been a great loser in the final result. Our losses commenced before the revolution, as shown by numerous instances in which distinguished Protestant families bear Catholic names. From this evident source of loss, it would be a sad narrative if we could give the statistics of losses during and since the periods of great immigration. I can only mention now what Bishop England said. He estimated the number of Catholics in his own diocese of Charleston in 1836 at 12,000, and the descendants of Catholics who were then Protestants he named at 38,000 or 40,000, and he expressed the conviction that the Catholic Church in the United States during the fifty years from 1786 to 1836 had lost millions of members.

To summarize briefly the lessons taught by our century's history, I would say that it is the duty of the Catholics in our day to provide the means of preventing the loss of faith by Catholics, from whatever causes, to recover as far as possible from our losses, to pro-

vide Catholic free schools for all the Catholic children in the land, to present to the American people a firm and persevering claim for fair play in the matter of educating our children, to claim for Catholic Indians freedom of religion and education, and free access to them by Catholic missionaries, to provide the means of evangelizing the colored population, to claim from the government Catholic chaplains for the Catholic soldiers and sailors in the service, and from the state governments freedom of worship for Catholic inmates of all public institutions, and to keep up a perpetual crusade against intemperance. The greatest element of success in these noble works is *Union among Catholics.*

CHURCH MUSIC.

THIRTEENTH REGULAR PAPER, BY PROF. HEMAN ALLEN, A. M., OF CHICAGO, ILL.

WHAT is church music? Is it the music we hear everywhere around us, and called "church music" merely when it is sung in churches? or is it a style of music peculiarly designed and adapted for the church, the house of God? A visitor to one of our Catholic churches, who had not given any thought to the subject, might answer, "the former." For he would hear there precisely, or almost precisely, the style of music he may have heard the evening before, in the concert hall, the theatre, or the opera house. But is this church music? Was it this music, which Jesus and his disciples sung, as St. Mark tells us, before they went forth to the Mount of Olives? Surely not. It would be blasphemy for us to say so, and we cannot even entertain the idea of it for a moment.

What, then, is church music? Are there rules which prescribe what music shall be sung in the church? And are there marks, by which we shall know it? There are both rules to teach, and marks to guide us. At first, any rule must have been unnecessary, so long as the memory or tradition of that heavenly hymn was preserved among Christians; but, as the people became lukewarm, and more "of the earth, earthy," so music degenerated more and more. But these beginnings of abuses in her music did not escape the watchful eye of our mother, the church. She preserved, and ever will preserve, the divine traditions, handed down by the successors of Jesus and his disciples, namely, her popes and bishops, and she began early to reform; *lavare quod est sordidum, regere quod est devium;* and to prescribe rules for the guidance of her children. And she has never wanted in children who were ready to follow and teach her rules. Witness the labors of St. Athanasius and of St. Ambrose, in the fourth century, of St. Gregory, in the sixth, and of those illustrious reformers of the sixteenth, who gave us the heavenly music of Palestrina and his school, as a complement to that inspired music, the only music which the church claims as her own, the Gregorian. And now we are in the midst of perhaps the most important, wide-spread, reform of all; that great movement inaugurated twenty years ago, by the Cæcilia Verein, in Germany, and

afterwards, by the Cæcilia Society in America. The following beautiful thoughts on our subject, are from the pen of the zealous and gifted president of the American Cæcilia Verein, Chevalier John Singenberger:

"Church music is a prayer, the prayer of the church in the solemn form of song, the liturgical prayer, not the prayer or sentiment of any individual member of the church. As the liturgy is dictated by the Holy Ghost, so is the prayer, and the melody of the prayer, in the liturgy. And this prayer we must take and sing in the spirit and with the sentiments of the church. The church must be our teacher in this regard, as in everything else. She therefore gives us rules which we are bound to obey, as well as any other of her rules. The Catholic cannot, like the Protestant, interpret these rules in his own way. If we do not follow the church, we are not good children of the church. No one is exempt from obedience. But, in fact, these rules are so natural, so apparent, and so necessary, that a true Catholic would discover and follow them, even if they had never been formally declared. If there were more true faith in our times, there would be more obedience to the church, and a better church music; and therefore, to reform and cultivate church music, is to make Catholics more faithful and more obedient to the church, to enable them better to understand and live up to the spirit of the church, and of the ecclesiastical year, and, as Bishop Marty has said, 'To make the divine service more useful to them, to work out the salvation of their souls.' On the other hand, to indulge in music which is not church music, and to tolerate abuses because some are accustomed to them, and like them, is to work against the will of the church, and, therefore, against the salvation of our souls. McMaster has said that 'much so-called church music is indeed devils' music.'"

True church music is, therefore, the music which the church approves of, recommends, or permits. No other music, however beautiful, or faultlessly composed, can claim the title of church music. Now the church approves most emphatically of Gregorian music, she recommends polyphonic music, *á la* Palestrina, and permits modern music, in so far as it obeys her regulations laid down at different times. Among these regulations are the following important ones: (*a*) The words of the text must come in the order which is given in the missal, or graduale. (*b*) In a musical phrase, the sacred text must not be shortened, or transposed, or lengthened, by too frequent repetitions. (*c*) Not a word is to be added to or left out of the text. (*d*) Arias, duets, trios, etc., are forbidden, as also recitative. (*e*) It is forbidden, where it is possible to avoid it, to sing different words at the same time at Mass or at any other service; for the words must be distinctly heard. (*f*) It is forbidden to introduce into a church composition any gay or lascivious music, music of the concert hall, the theatre, or the opera house. (*g*) No instruments but the organ are allowed, unless by the consent of the bishop.

It remains for us to decide which style of music obeys these regulations, and which does not, and then we shall know which is the true church music.

No one can deny that the Gregorian chant obeys them in every particular; and again and again has the church claimed this as her own and favorite music. It is the darling child, the Benjamin of the church. Pope Benedict XIV, speaking of it, says: "The Gregorian chant is that song which excites the minds of the faithful to piety and devotion; it is that music, therefore, which, if sung in our churches with care and decorum, is most willingly heard by devout persons, and is justly preferred to that which is called figured, or harmonized music. The titillation of figured music is held very cheaply by men of religious mind, in comparison with the sweetness of the church chant, and hence it is that the people flock to the churches of the monks, who, taking piety for their guide, in singing the praises of God, after the counsel of the prince of psalmists, skilfully sing to their Lord as Lord, and serve God as God, with the utmost reverence."

Dom Pothier, that great authority on plain chant, says of it: "These melodies are so far beyond comparison, that the ancient Christians did not hesitate to look upon them as the work of divine inspiration, and there can, indeed, be no doubt that they interpret the sacred words better than the best compositions of modern musical art. For they express most accurately the thoughts and sentiments of the church, and elicit more profound, more solemn, and holier emotions in the soul of man. Though, on account of their forms, which for centuries have ever remained the same, they may appear rather strange at first sight, yet for him who has learned to appreciate and understand them, they will soon be a source of joys of a superior order."

Beautifully, also, does Maurice Vogt write: "These fixed, measured, emphatic, sublime, true, chaste, free-breathing, beautiful, and truly holy melodies have been composed by holy men. The song eschews the court of the prince, and never enters the concert hall or music saloon; it ventures within the holy of holies and abides there. No one has ever sought to drive it out of the church of God, unless he did not belong to the house of God. This music has ever commanded honor and esteem, because, like a queen, she sets up her throne in the temples of the Most High, and with a clear voice makes herself heard when the preacher is silent in the sanctuary."

And, to quote one more lover of plain chant, Dr. Witt, late president of the German Cæcilia Verein, says: "It is my opinion that the Gregorian music is, in its way, as perfect a masterpiece as a symphony of Beethoven, or the Don Giovanni of Mozart, in their way, and that the *Missa Papæ Marcelli*, composed in 1565, is just as precious and imperishable as the *Freischütz* of C. M. von Weber." And he goes on to say that it is absurd to assert, that because an art is old, it is inferior. For is not Homer as great at least, as Goethe, and who has ever excelled the sculptors of ancient Greece?

Pius IX was an ardent apostle of Gregorian chant, and when he established the Seminario Pio, he ordered that the students should be taught the Gregorian chant, "to the exclusion of all other music."

It is hard to stop speaking of such an inspiring subject; but this

paper is to be confined to one volume, and we have other things to consider yet. After admiring that eldest and favorite child of the church, let us contemplate another well beloved one, the music, namely, of Palestrina, *princeps musicæ*, and of his followers, called, on account of its imitation of that great master, *Alla Palestrina*.

As is well known, we owe the wonderful church music of Palestrina, and all the beautiful music of that school called *Alla Palestrina*, to that famous decision of cardinals in the days of Pius IV, headed by Vitellozzo Vitelli and Carlo Borromeo, a decision which sounded the death knell of all "figured" church music, unless it could be made to conform to the rules of the church, and especially unless it could be so written that the words of the sacred text could be distinctly understood. We know how a committee of the best musicians of the day, to whom this decision was announced, declared that it was impossible to compose a long composition of any merit with the necessary "imitations" and "fugues," so that the words could be distinctly understood; and we know how Palestrina, when applied to to compose a Mass, which should comply with these conditions, lifted his eyes to heaven and prayed, *Domine illumina oculos meos*, and that the result of his prayers and of his efforts was the production of those immortal masterpieces of church music, of which the *Missa Papæ Marcelli* is so famous. As Rev. Carl Becker says: "The success was decisive. The committee of cardinals declared that they could not find a cause to make a change in church music; that the singers, however, should always be cautious to select similar music for the divine service to that which they had just heard. In these words the authorized committee sanctioned and recommended that style of music, which indeed was not invented by Palestrina, and for this reason may be rightly termed the Palestrina style."

The same writer says: "The music of Palestrina has been said to be 'entirely unlike the Gregorian,' while it is acknowledged by competent authorities that the Gregorian is the foundation of Palestrina's music. And how could it be otherwise? It was Palestrina who, upon the injunction of Pope Gregory XIII, commenced the vast work of the revision of the *Directorium Chori*, according to the oldest and best codices of the Vatican. How could Palestrina compose otherwise than in the spirit of the Gregorian, in the study of which he was engaged all his life? It is true, Palestrina's music is unlike the Gregorian, inasmuch as the rhythm is that of figured music, but the spirit and the melody are either the same or analogous."

The historian Ambros, quoted by Father Becker, says: "It is no music for the concert hall or the musical academy. * * * It is music for the church, for divine service, for the ecclesiastical year, with its feasts and seasons, with its days of sorrow, consolation, joy, solemnity, thanksgiving, and adoration." And Dr. Witt says: "The sixteenth century is an epoch in art, which developed one style of music, and of musical composition, which, indeed, was not invented, but perfected by Palestrina, in such a marvellous manner that I cannot think further progress in that particular direction is possible." "We shall never forget," said an eminent German musician, speak-

ing of the first performance of the Cæcilia Verein, "the Mass, *Qui Complerentur*, by Palestrina, the *Miserere*, or the *Missa pro Defunctis*, by Vittoria."

If time permitted, we might examine exquisite Masses and motettes of Orlando Lasso, Vittoria, Anerio, Croce, Handel, Hassler, Suriano, Casciolini, and others, but we must leave them, and give a hasty glance at those of a few of the great composers of the Cæcilia Verein, of Dr. Witt, Carl Greith, Adolph Kaim, etc.

The London Tablet said, several years ago of this music: "The music of the Ratisbonne school of composers is a revelation. Completely free from dramatical effects, pompousness, chromatic wailing, and hysterical sentimentality, its effect is marvellous. Those who have never heard anything but church music in the secular style, will be amazed at the wondrous power of the divine art, inspired by the power of the liturgy. It must be confessed that music of this kind completely spoils one for the productions of those who insist upon employing abstract music in churches. * * * The drift of all the instructions issued by the pope, provincial councils, and individual bishops, is not art alone, and for itself, but art in union with the liturgy. Dr. Witt's music exactly carries out this idea. When we hear it, we hear the church's prayer, not Dr. Witt's, and this is the object of ecclesiastical music. It proves to us that figured music may be modern, yet not in opposition to our prototype, plain chant, and, that to preserve this unity it is absolutely necessary to have studied and compared the works of the old masters. This, indeed, is one of the fundamental doctrines of the Ratisbonne school, of which Dr. Witt is so distinguished an ornament, and, necessarily, influences its style. Dr. Witt's melodies are delightful; so modest and simple, so free from excitement and mawkishness. His harmonies are scientific, without that stiffness of mere imitators of the old ecclesiastical writers, and no man knows better how to sum up, as it were, all that has gone before, in one pathetic, lingering cadence. The *Kyrie*, and *Agnus Dei*, in St. Cæcilia's Mass, are masterpieces of contrapuntal art."

A French magazine, quoted in the Catholic World, says of Witt: "As a composer of religious music, Witt far surpasses the most of his contemporaries, and, if we regard the transcendent character of his musical works, we have only too much reason to exclaim, 'Inexorable death has robbed us of a second Palestrina.'"

Beautiful, also, and full of tender devotion, are the masses of Kaim, the well known one "In Honor of St. Cæcilia," and the *Missa Jesu Redemptor;* and the masses *Sine Nomine*, and *L'Hora Passa* of Viadana, have a fragrance of sweet innocence about them that comes to one like the fresh air of a country meadow.

There is still another class of music which can be called "church music," and that is, all that modern music written for the church, which, although not in the *Alla Palestrina* style, still conforms, on the whole, to the regulations of the church. Such are the magnificent Mass in C, by Beethoven, the eighth and ninth Masses of Mozart in F and D, several of Gounod's Masses, etc.

After having seen what true church music is, it is easy to

define bad church music, for it is simply that music which does not obey the regulations of the church; and, unfortunately, most of Mozart's Masses, all of Haydn's, Mercadante's, and a host of others, come under this head.

It is painful for the musician who has been used to rank the operas, symphonies, quartettes, or other concerted music of Beethoven, Mozart, Haydn, Weber, and other great composers, with all that is perfect and beautiful of their kind, nay, almost to surround them with a halo of inspiration, it is painful for him to be forced to acknowledge that much of their so-called church music is no church music at all. Yet that is the sad fact. With the exception of the greater part of Beethoven's Mass in C, the above-mentioned Masses of Mozart, and a few others, the masses of these great composers are not liturgical, and cannot, therefore, properly be sung in church. They are not liturgical, for they are written in a worldly, profane style; they are so full of repetitions that the "words of the sacred text are not intelligible," and they are so lengthened out that they impede most seriously the progress of the holy sacrifice. To instance only one out of a multitude of cases, Father Alfred Young, one Sunday, "irreverently timed the singing of an amen to a *Credo*, and found that the priest's fast was lengthened by it just four minutes and a half."

The music, also, in the finest of these Masses, is often entirely out of keeping with the sentiment of the words. One or two instances of this must suffice also. The *Kyrie* of the great imperial Mass of Haydn begins with a blast of trumpets and a roll of kettle drums, and the whole movement is in a style of exultation and worldly pomp. Was this pious Joseph Haydn's idea of the interpretation of those aspirations of humble supplication, "Lord, have mercy upon us"? Not at all! But Herr Hof-Cappellmeister Haydn was composing a mass, not so much to worship the King of Heaven as to celebrate the coronation of some great potentate of the earth.

Let us compare, with Dr. Witt, the famous aria, *Agnus Dei*, in Mozart's first Mass, with the Gregorian *Agnus Dei*, in the Mass for Sundays in Lent and Advent, and then answer his question, "Which is the more appropriate for the sacrifice of the Mass?"

And if composers will write music to be sung to princes and congregations, need we be surprised that choirs sing rather to the congregation than to the praise and glory of God? For everything about the music is calculated to remind them of an audience, rather than of a religious service.

And what is the effect of such music on the morals and behavior of the choir? Let us look at two pictures, both of which we can see every Sunday. Scene of the first picture: The "organ loft" of a fashionable church. Time: A few minutes before high Mass. The soprano bustles in, fashionably dressed, with an air of peculiar importance. After wishing the organist "good morning," she says, "Have you selected an offertory piece?" "Well, yes," replies he, rather apologetically, "I had thought of the air from Rinaldo, for alto solo." "What! that—that dear old acquaintance! Well, it's all Miss A can sing, it's true. But Mr. B, I think you'll

have to change your programme to-day. You see I have invited some friends to hear me to-day, and I've brought my aria from *Der Freischütz* to sing. True, it is sung very often, but you know it never grows old, and you'll see what a sensation it will make when *I* sing it. By the way, what Mass do we sing this morning? Weber's? H—m! lovely, but it won't do. You know the *Agnus* is an alto solo, and comes before the soprano solo, too. No, no, my dear Mr. B, we can't have that. Let us take some other one. I have it! La Hache's is the thing. That has no alto part at all. Just then the alto enters, with her offertory, and we prudently withdraw, just as Miss A says, with a deep sigh, "Oh, why will no one write a Mass with no soprano part to it?"

But now let us gaze on this other picture. A long procession of surpliced boys and men slowly approach the sanctuary from a side door, preceded by the processional cross and two lighted candles. Quietly and reverently they take their places in the sacred enclosure, and the solemn Mass begins. We scarcely notice the music, for we are wrapt at once in the holy sacrifice, truly a "solemn high Mass," of which the music is an essential part, and yet does not distract, but rather guides us. But when the priest intones the *Dominus vobiscum*, we all exclaim, our hearts full of devotion and adoration, *Et cum spiritu tuo*, and at the preface we all cry out, *Sursum corda*. We have lifted up our hearts, for it is meet and just. Which of these two pictures most resembles that vision of Jesus and his disciples who "sung a hymn"? A hymn of adoration and praise!

A few years ago the music in the cathedral of a certain great city was strictly liturgical. The choir was not, as yet, one of surpliced boys and men, but was composed of young men and women of the congregation. It was an edifying sight to see them, with their calm and serious faces, and their neat and modest dress. They sung the introit and offertory and communion proper to the Sunday, and, for the Mass, music which was approved by the church, and pious people in the congregation said, "Now we can pray." The rector, a holy and zealous man, in a discourse delivered at a meeting of the Cæcilia Verein, said, that since he had had that music the attendance at high Mass had been larger, and the collections more generous than when "we had," as he expressed it, "opera in the church." The bishop, who entered heart and soul into the music, exclaimed one day to his choir director, "That shall be the music in this cathedral as long as I live," and it was.

And now the question arises: What are Catholics doing at the present day for the reform of church music? For, in spite of all that holy popes and bishops and councils have done, there is yet an immense deal to be done. The answer is reassuring. Societies have been formed in Europe and America, animated by the most Catholic and apostolic spirit, for the purpose of introducing everywhere the song of the church. Individuals too, have joined in the pious work with enthusiasm. The Cæcilia Verein, in Europe and America, has spread the knowledge and love of the Gregorian and "Cæcilian" music over all Europe and America. We use the term "Cæcilian" advisedly; for, as the late Dr. Witt has said, "The

task of the Cæcilia Society is to make *all* the good and suitable church music that has been composed in the last 2,000 years serviceable to the church." Father Becker says: "The programme and basis of the St. Cæcilia Society may be stated as follows: The Cæcilian catalogue of to-day contains over 1,000 numbers, comprising Masses, collections of musical pieces and theoretical works. The programme or the mission of the St. Cæcilia Society is to promote the Gregorian chant, and to cultivate figured music within the limits drawn by the laws of the church; its basis is the approval and blessing of Rome."

But why then do we not have this beautiful Catholic music in our Catholic churches? For the same reason, probably, that there are so few very good Catholics; and that out of the "many called" so "few are chosen"; because the devil tries hard to keep it out of the churches. If it once gets in, he will have a very hard time of it. How he goes to work we can guess by meditating on the words of Chevalier Singenberger, quoted at the beginning of this paper; by inspiring people with a spirit of pride and disobedience to the church; even with a spirit of indifference or infidelity. But, while the devil is very sensible himself, he covers his victims over with a coating of stupidity, as the anaconda lubricates his victim before swallowing it. For how can any sane or intelligent person prefer the worldly music of our churches to the heavenly music the church offers us? "But," we are told by people who cannot make up their minds to obey without questioning the commands of the church, "We must not give all the good tunes to the devil!" or, "This or that lovely music will have an edifying effect upon the congregation." We answer them: "We have an authority to tell us what music we are to sing, and that is the church. She teaches us that our first duty is to worship God, and after that, to edify our neighbor, and that we cannot at the same time worship God and disobey the laws of his church.

Very few, however, really think that this unliturgical music is appropriate; and, if cornered, they would confess that the music prescribed by the church was the true music. But some like the operatic style because they are not spiritual and do not like spiritual things. Others, who might have influence, are afraid to use it, and finally much of the indifference to church music is due to the deplorable neglect of it in Catholic schools and seminaries. Our children and students should hear it and sing it every day, and our Sunday-school children should be taught to sing it at school and at Sunday Mass.

Meanwhile, it is a curious and mortifying fact, that, while there is at present scarcely one large Catholic church in the west in which the church music is liturgical, or makes any pretense of being so, there are twenty-two choirs, composed of boys and men, in Episcopalian churches, in the diocese of Chicago alone; and these, while they have no Palestrina, no Orlando Lasso, no Franz Witt, priceless treasures which we have, and do not value, do have an immense catalogue of serious and devotional music; and this they study carefully, singing it in their services, and in concerts, in

which latter sometimes many choirs unite. The congregations are proud of them, and keep their ranks filled from their families. If, then, this music is so popular in Protestant why should it not be in Catholic churches? Indeed, Father Young, and the Paulist Fathers have long since proved that the Gregorian chant is popular when it is well sung, and Father Young will soon be able to show us the same for congregational singing.

"And after they had sung a hymn, they went forth to the mount of Olives." Oh, blessed hymn! Divine cantor! Angelic chorus! Shall we never hear you again? Never, until we reach the heavenly city? God grant we may! As we expect that he will one day move the hearts of men, in an extraordinary manner, as he has, in former ages, by the words and deeds of his saints, his preaching friars, his Chrysostoms, his Bernards, and his Anthonys, so may we confidently hope for the complete success of the church, through her holy bishops, priests, and laymen, in her work of purifying and sanctifying the music of her temple. But every bishop, priest, and layman, who has the good cause at heart, will have to do his part; some by active labors, in organizing, encouraging, and commanding, others by their earnest prayers and active coöperation. Let those pious souls, who say so many prayers and offer so many Masses for their own spiritual and temporal necessities, and those of dear friends, pray also for these intentions of the church, not forgetting that incalculable influence for good will come with liturgical and edifying music in the churches; that faith, hope, and charity will grow firmer, and warmer. With what a ravishing "odor of sweetness" will then those words be accompanied, when applied to a Catholic congregation, going forth from the holy sacrifice, to the joys and sorrows of the world, "And after they had sung a hymn, they went forth to the Mount of Olives."

A vote of thanks was tendered to Mr. Campbell for his article on temperance. A resolution of thanks was offered to the chairman for the able manner in which he presided over the convention. The Committee on Future Congresses was empowered to add to their number.

MR. ONAHAN: "I wish to make a statement which will be brief, and a motion in connection with it. You may not be aware that the appointment of the committee on future congresses did not contemplate a report at this meeting. The appointment of that committee was made only this afternoon, and of course no meeting of the committee has been possible. In that connection, I hope the gentlemen of this congress will allow me to present, in the name of the Chicago delegation, a motion. There is no member of this convention who does not feel delighted that he is here to-day at this grand gathering of the Catholic laymen of America. It shows, gentlemen, what is possible among us, and it suggests to our minds the necessity of more frequent meetings of this character. I, therefore, on

the part of the Chicago delegation, move that there be an international congress called not later than 1892, and that it be held in the city of Chicago. It can be convened there that year under happy conditions in every respect. Allusion has been made to the circumstance that the suggestion of this present congress proceeded from Chicago, where the first measures towards calling it together were initiated. I can speak with authority for the warmth of welcome and splendid hospitality with which such a gathering would be hailed by all the people of Chicago without distinction of religious lines. The congress can there assemble in the grandest hall on the continent, and we promise you a true western welcome.

MR. J. H. CAMPBELL: "I would make an amendment to that motion. I think it is a very proper thing to have a convention held in 1892. It is an admirable motion, an admirable idea; but I think an amendment ought to be put in—while I have not the slightest objection to Chicago in the world—that the international congress should be held in the city where the world's fair is held. (Applause.) I have not the slightest objection to Chicago; I think it is one of the greatest cities in the world, and if it gets the world's fair, we want to hold it in Chicago. (Applause.) But, on the other hand, I guess Chicago people themselves will admit, and perhaps Mr. Onahan also will admit that if the world's fair is to be held in any other city, whether in New York, or Washington, or anywhere else, that the eyes of the world will be on that city at the time, and that is where the Catholic international congress ought to be held." (Applause.)

MR. ONAHAN: "I beg leave to cordially and heartily accept the amendment of the gentleman from Philadelphia, because there is no doubt in the minds of the Chicagoans that the world's fair will be held there." (Laughter.)

MR. SPAUNHORST: "This matter was left, as I understand it, in the hands of a committee. Otherwise I am in favor of this resolution, because we are going to get the fair in St. Louis anyhow." (Laughter and applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: "The chair does not see exactly how this congress can confine the action of the committee as to the place of holding the next congress in any particular place by any action it may take at this time."

MR. CAMPBELL: "There seems to be a misapprehension with respect to this matter. The motion of Mr. Onahan, as I understood it, was that the proposed international Catholic congress should be held in the city of Chicago in 1892. I offered an amendment that

instead of designating Chicago as the city the proposed international Catholic congress should be held in 1892 in whatever city had the world's fair."

THE CHAIRMAN: "I believe that Mr. Onahan has accepted the amendment proposed by Mr. Campbell. The motion as amended is now before the congress."

The question was put, and the motion as amended was agreed to unanimously.

By unanimous vote the thanks of the congress was ordered to be given to Mr. Onahan, chairman of the committee on organization, and to his associates, Messrs Spaunhorst, Rudd, Keiley, and Shea; also to Mr. Brownson, chairman of the committee on papers, and to his associates, Messrs Foy and Harson, for their able and successful labors in organizing the congress.

The thanks of the congress were likewise extended to His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, and to the people and press of Baltimore for the hospitable treatment given to the congress, and for the many courtesies to the members during this memorable celebration.

THE CHAIRMAN: "In response to the desire of the delegates, Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, will address the congress." (Applause.)

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND'S ADDRESS.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:—I have but a few words to say. They are these: Go to your homes filled with the enthusiasm that has marked this first Catholic congress of America. You have come here as delegates from your several states, you have listened to speeches and to papers, you have been inhaling the magnificent Catholic atmosphere that has distinguished Baltimore during these three days. Go back to your homes and carry with you there this enthusiasm and spread it through every state of the Union. (Applause.) Go back and say to your fellow Catholics that there is a departure among the Catholics of the United States. (Renewed applause.) Tell them that heretofore, so to speak, you have done but little, but that henceforth you are going to do great things. Tell them that there is a mission open for laymen. (Applause.) Speak to them and organize them and tell them the good that has been done. For my part, I am rejoiced. The long-expected day has come when the Catholics of the United States, the archbishops, the bishops, the priests, and the laymen will rise up as one man and say, We will henceforth act in a manner worthy of our holy religion. (Applause.)

Aye, gentlemen, when we look around us and see what energy is put in the works of mere secular affairs, when we see what energy

is put in works for political success, ought we not to be ashamed of ourselves, since we represent God's truth, God's cross, and our leader is Jesus Christ and the incarnate God whose home is in heaven? We ought to exert every human effort to practise and spread the sacred truths of our holy religion. (Applause.)

We ought to be so enthusiastic and so full of our holy cause that every day and every hour with our whole heart and our whole soul we shall work for him, our Master in heaven. In vain will we tell our fellow-citizens that we have God's truth in our minds, God's love in our hearts, if we do not by our enthusiastic action prove the faith and the love that is in us.

If you do this you will come back to future congresses better prepared. You will come back to them to tell of victories achieved. Each year from now on must show a marked progress in the United States for our holy religion, and in order that it shall be marked throughout the United States progress must be shown in every state, in every city, and in every village. (Applause.)

Now, do not go back to sleep and slumber, as in the past — go back to work. (Applause.) Go back inspired, go back true Catholics and live like Catholics, and God will bless you. For my part, I am overjoyed to see so many laymen, overjoyed to listen to such magnificent discourses and such grand papers, and to have realized that there is among our Catholics in America so much talent, so much strong faith. As one of your bishops, I am ashamed of myself that I was not conscious before this of the power existing in the midst of the laity (applause), and that I have not done anything to bring it out. But one thing I will do, with God's help. In the future I shall do all I can to bring out this power. I assure you, in the name of the bishops and priests, that we will lead, but I shall be very glad to see you get ahead of us in something. (Applause.) May God bless you and aid you in your work. (Applause.)

Mr. M. W. O'Brien, of Detroit: "I move that this congress do now adjourn."

The motion was agreed to, and the congress adjourned.

The following letter from His Eminence, Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney, was received after the congress had adjourned:

St. Mary's Cathedral,
Sydney, N. S. W., October 19, 1889.

Dear and Honored Sir: On yesterday I received your esteemed invitation to be present at the congress of the Catholic laity of the United States in Baltimore, on November 11. I regret that in our present steamer arrangements it is not possible for me to be with you at that date. Were this letter to reach you before the meeting of your congress I would most heartily wish you every success. As it is, I fear it will not reach Chicago till after the congress shall have marked a bright page in the grand history of the American church, and I may be permitted by anticipation to congratulate you on its

successful celebration and on the many happy fruits that shall result from it. At this side of the Pacific ocean we are endeavoring to follow at a distance, and in a humble way, the giant strides that religion is making in the United States. Every triumph of the church with you is a triumph for us, and each step in advance in your glorious church is a model for us to imitate at some future day. Should age and strength and leisure permit, I may hope some time to pay a visit to the United States, in the ranks of whose clergy I reckon so many friends of my earlier years. In the mean time, I beg to assure you that the heartiest and best wishes of the Australian church are with your congress and with all the admirable works in which it shall be engaged.

Believe me to remain your faithful and devoted servant,

PATRICK FRANCIS, CARDINAL MORAN,
Archbishop of Sydney.

WM. J. ONAHAN,
Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.

LIST OF DELEGATES.

ALABAMA.—F. C. Brent, Mobile; D. S. Troy, Montgomery; Rev. James A. Meurer, Birmingham.

ARKANSAS.—D. W. Carroll, Little Rock; B. F. Du Val, Ft. Smith; James Murphy, Arkansas City.

CALIFORNIA.—V. Rev. Joseph Sasia, S. J., San Francisco; V. Rev. J. Adam, V. G., Los Angeles.

COLORADO.—J. Richter, Pueblo,

CONNECTICUT.—John E. Scanlan, John Risser, J. J. Loftus, Rev. Wm. Maher, Hartford; C. T. Driscoll, Joseph E. Taylor, John E. McPartland, New Haven; Rev. T. P. Joynt, A. L. Chappell, New London.

DAKOTA.—Dr. V. Harold, Ft. Buford; Wm. L. McLaughlin, Sioux Falls.

DELAWARE.—John K. Bradford, John P. Donahoe, J. S. Brennan, Wilmington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Thos. Sheridan, John T. Coughlin, Edmond Mallet, A. P. Morse, Rev. J. H. Richards, S. J., Eugene D. F. Brady, Milton E. Smith, George W. Maher, Dr. Wm. F. Byrns, Dr. P. J. Murphy, Bro. Alphæus, Eugene T. Arnolds, Martin F. Morris, Tallmadge A. Lambert, Geo. E. Hamilton, Geo. W. M. Hill, Rev. E. H. Welch, S. J., Washington.

FLORIDA.—V. Rev. J. B. Baasen, Pensacola.

GEORGIA—J. C. Payne, James S. O'Neill, John J. Lynch, V. Rev. B. J. Keiley, V. G., Atlanta; Patrick Walsh, Augusta.

ILLINOIS.—John P. Boughan, D. F. Bremner, M. W. Kelly, Geo. W. Smith, James H. Burke, Rev. E. A. Higgins, S. J., Rev. F. X. Schulack, S. J., Rev. E. J. Dunne, Wm. A. Doyle, M. St. P. Thomas, Adam Meyer, Peter Kiolbassa, J. G. Demes, J. A. Koenig, F. X. Brandecker, Jr., P. F. Gillespie, Wm. L. Loeffel, John H. Burke, D. J. Gallery, D. J. McMahon, W. W. Brown, Chas. S. Winslow, Patrick Cavanaugh, John W. Garvy, Dr. John Guerin, Michael Doyle, Dr. J. J. Larkin, Daniel Deasey, John McCabe, J. M. Dowling, John Burke, Rev. John Lilla, Wladislaus Smulski, P. J. Healy, Rev. J. L. Grogan, W. J. Onahan, John M. Duffy, Rev. M. Fitzsimmons, Rev. D. A. Tighe, Ch. A. Mair, Rev. Geo. J. Blatter, M. F. Raftree, P. T. Barry, J. J. Fitzgibbon, Rev. Wm. Horan, Rev. Wm. White, Rev. John P. Hogan, Rev. P. J. O'Connor, Bro. Adjutor, J. F. O'Connor, A. Brosseau, James Armstrong, John F. Scanlan, John McMullen, Rev. A. Tolton, M. R. Morgan, Chicago; M. Reis, John A. Bedell, M. Boul, B. Kepell, W. Holdner, Belleville; Rev. J. B. Schnelten, Olney; Henry Schnelten, Carrolton; J. Wise, Alton; N. Kelligar, Pana.

INDIANA.—John N. Breen, Logotee; Henry Cawthorn, Vincennes; Francis Burke, Jeffersonville; George Korbly, W. H. Horoff, Madison; H.

Hulmann, Terre Haute; Rev. C. Thomas, O. S. B., Huntington; Peter Schat, Brookville; Rt. Rev. F. Mundwiler, O. S. B., St. Meinrad's; Wm. P. Breen, H. C. Berghoff, P. S. O'Rourke, Jos. V. Fox, A. C. Trentman, Ft. Wayne; J. F. Edwards, Notre Dame; M. D. Fansler, Robt. Carroll, Logansport; John T. Mugg, Lafayette.

IOWA.—Bart. E. Linehan, D. J. Hennessy, A. C. Cooper, Jr., Rev. P. J. Burke, Rev. R. Ryan, Rev. F. Louis, Dubuque; John Lillis, E. T. Lynch, F. B. Sharon, Davenport; John Rogers, Des Moines; George Hummer, Iowa City.

KANSAS.—Rt. Rev. I. Wolf, O. S. B., Atchison; Thos. Fenelon, B. Blair, John O'Flanagan, Leavenworth; D. O'Brien, Michael Henry, Topeka; Dr. A. Letourneau, Concordia.

KENTUCKY.—V. Rev. L. G. Deppen, Dan'l Dougherty, Louisville; Jas. W. Bryan, B. Becker, J. H. Mersman, M. T. Shine, Wm. A. Byrne, W. W. Cleary, Covington.

LOUISIANA.—Frank McGloin, John T. Gibbons, Henry Chappella, J. B. Fisher, J. N. Augustine, Paul Capderielle, M. S. Mahony, J. B. Buchanan, Jos. Bowling, John J. O'Connor, James D. Coleman, Thos. J. Semmes, New Orleans; Geo. W. Young, Jos. Lorras, J. J. Quinn, A. Cassard, Red River Landing.

MAINE.—Dr. Jas. Grady, Eastport; Dr. J. L. Fortier, Waterville; Dr. L. J. Martel, Lewiston; Dan'l Cote, Biddeford; Thos. J. Lynch, Augusta; John B. Donovan, Alfred; C. J. McCarthy, Wm. H. Looney, T. P. McGovern, D. O. C. O'Donoghue, Thos. F. Donahue, Jas. Cunningham, Denis A. Meaher, Portland.

MARYLAND.—William Walsh, Cumberland; Ernest Lagarde, Rev. E. P. Allen, D. D., Emmittsburg; Daniel A. Boone, Michael Jenkins, John B. Piet, Clarence J. Holloway, F. X. Ward, C. Halstead, Robt. A. Jamison, C. K. Lord, Chas. G. Kerr, W. F. Campbell, J. S. Mauray, Chas. B. Roberts, James Higgins, Jr., H. W. Tehan, F. J. Martin, Henry Rosendale, John T. Marius, C. J. Bonaparte, Geo. K. Teltie, Thos. J. Sullivan, M. M. Snell, R. M. Johnston, W. R. Reilly, E. J. Molloy, Dr. S. A. Keene, O. Horsey, J. F. McEvoy, Jas. Doyle, Wm. H. Perkins, Jr., John Findlay, W. J. Snieringer, Jas. McDonough, Edm. Ryan, F. X. Russell, Francis McKin, Wm. J. Carroll, J. A. Fink, Louis Mercert, G. W. S. Giddens, Dr. C. O'Donovan, Jr., Chas. S. Gundall, F. J. Disney, Thos. Muldowny, John P. O'Ferrall, J. A. McDonough, Jas. P. Gaffney, Bro. Romuald, Bro. Quintinian, Bro. Edward, Bro. Virgil, Viscount de Meaux, Harvey E. Mann, E. S. Delone, Wm. L. Solean, J. H. Smithson, C. W. Heuisler, Adam Denpert, Thos. Meegan, J. L. Miller, Jas. A. Smith, John M. Wilhelm, Ign. Turner, Rt. Rev. John Hintenach, Thos. A. Whelan, Rev. T. W. Hayes, J. F. Roth, Chas. Becker, Michael A. Mullin, Wm. T. Mullin John Donnelly, Wm. J. Donnelly, Jas. Carroll, Philip Singleton, D. J. Murphy Thos. F. Hicky, J. D. Wheeler, Al. Shriver, M. O. Shriver, C. C. Shriver, T. R. Jenkins, Patrick Philbin, A. Leo Knott, Alex, Yearley, John T. Carter, John B. McKee, J. S. J. Healy, Robt. Biggs, Henry F. Spalding, Philip Walsh, Jr., S. H. Caughy, J. E. Walsh, Jeff. Walsh, F. P. K. Walsh, J. M. Griffith, C. Miller, L. Miller, Jas. D. Moulton, Godfrey A. Smith, Dr. J. J. Stafford, John Rhein, P. J. McAvoy, A. F. Sterker, R. Coulahan, W. S. Coulahan, Thomas Kreutzer, Phil. N. Dwyer, Jas. A. Kennert, D. J. Foley, John S. Rinn, Chas. Becker, Rev. P. Griffith, L. W. Small, Edw. F. Milholland, Wm. McSherry, Jr., F. D. Gardener, R. B. I. Combs, Wm. J. O'Brien, Geo. May, Henry W. Mears, Philip A. Dickson, Jas. R. Wheeler, Hugh K. Barr, T. H. Shriver, Thos. G. Carroll, Will. H. McGowman, Rev. P. J. Donahue, Baltimore; Bro. Cajetan, Bro. Isadore, Bro. Maurice, Ellicott City; Rev. W. H. Reany, Liberty.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Rev. Thos. Scully, A. F. Dwyer, C. F. Donnelly, Rev. W. P. McQuaid, P. F. Sullivan, T. Sullivan, Jas. R. Murphy, Nicholas M. Williams, Samuel Tuckerman, Thos. B. Fitz, Jos. D. Fallon, Patrick Donahoe, J. B. O'Reilly, Bernard Carr, Jas. L. Walsh, Thos. Reilly, Dr. Wm. G. McDonald, Dr. Wm. A. Dunn, Edw. J. Flynn, Boston; Hugh F. Gillon, Lowell; Rev. J. P. Bodfish, Canton; Rev. M. D. Murphy, Hopkinton; Rev. P. A. McKenna, Marlboro; Dr. Wm. S. Byrnes, Springfield; Rev. R. Walsh, Rev. D. Scannell, Rev. M. A. O'Sullivan, Jas. Early, Geo. McAleer, Edw. F. Tower, Patrick H. Quinn, Worcester; M. R. Daley, Dr. J. B. Chapin, Edw. Amyot, Fall River.

MICHIGAN.—Rev. M. P. Dowling, S. J., M. W. O'Brien, John C. Donnelly, Wm. H. Hughes, Dr. A. Kaiser, H. F. Brownson, John Miner, Paul Rabaut, Jos. B. Moore, T. J. Larkin, John Hyde, H. W. Skinner, Wm. Y. Hamlin, John V. Moran, Rt. Rev. John S. Foley, Chas. S. McDonald, Sylvester Blake, J. E. Sullivan, John A. Russell, R. S. Willis, John J. Keenan, Jas. H. Vhay, H. W. Deare, R. R. Elliott, F. F. Palms, J. T. Keena. Wm. A. Dwyer, Jeremiah Dwyer, Thos. J. Paxton, Alex. Chapoton, Jr., Detroit; M. J. McHugh, Rev. Francis O'Brien, Jas. Rooney, Kalamazoo; V. Rev. P. A. Baart, Marshall; T. A. E. Weadock, Rev. Thos. Rafter, Bay City; John Killean, Grand Rapids; Rev. B. G. Soffers, Mgr. Joos, Monroe; Rev. J. W. Malaney, Jackson; V. Rev. Wm. H. Grimme, Manistee; Rev. M. J. P. Dempsey, Detroit.

MINNESOTA.—John S. Prince, Rev. J. J. Keane, Jas. C. Fitzgerald, M. W. Cole, John Twohy, L. M. Hastings, Wm. L. Kelly, Wm. L. Kelly, Jr., A. Dufrene, A. L. Larpenteur, J. M. Prendergast, J. C. Prendergast, M. R. Prendergast, Pat'k Butler, Thos. Berrisford, A. D. McLeod, M. Mealey, Chas. L. Haas, H. G. Haas, H. C. McNair, John Rogers, J. C. Kennedy, J. C. Nolan, St. Paul; John Sweetman, Currie; N. J. Miller, C. P. Maginnis, Duluth; John O'Brien, Stillwater; M. H. Keeley, Faribault; J. K. Cullen, Waverly; Anth. Kelly, Wm. S. Markoe, Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI.—M. Queyles, J. W. Lambert, Natchez; Rev. C. A. Oliver, D.D., Scranton.

MISSOURI.—H. J. Spaunhorst, Louis Fusz, Geo. A. Bannantine, Amédée V. Reyburn, Theophile Papin, Jr., Condé B. Pallen, Francis A. Drew, Wm. M. Tompkins, R. C. Kerens, Peter L. Foy, Rev. J. T. Tuohy, A. J. McDonald, Thos. A. Rice, Rev. J. P. Frieden, S. J., Rev. E. J. Gleeson, S. J., Fred. T. Ladergerber, Michael McEnnis, V. Rev. H. Muhlsiepen, St. Louis; Rev. P. B. O'Laughlin, Rolla; Jerome G. Boarman, Dr. G. W. Fitzpatrick, Dr. J. A. Harrigan, Kansas City; Rev. F. W. Graham, Rev. A. Newman, M. J. McCabe, Bernard Patton, St. Joseph.

NEBRASKA.—John A. Creighton, John A. McShane, C. W. Hamilton, T. G. Gillmore, Chas. Taggart, John Baumer, W. A. L. Gibbons, Chas. McDonald, John B. Furay, J. F. Kinsler, Omaha; John Fitzgerald, Wm. McLaughlin, J. J. Butler, Jas. Ledwith, Chas. McGlare, Lincoln.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—V. Rev. John E. Barry, V. G., John M. Mitchell, Concord; Rev. E. M. O'Callaghan, Portsmouth; Rev. P. J. Finnegan, Claremont; Rev. J. Canning, Exeter; Rev. J. H. B. Milette, Nashua; John C. Linehan, Penacook; Rev. R. McEvoy, Peterboro; Jas. T. Donahoe, Rev. J. A. Chevalier, Rev. J. J. Lyons, Frank C. Miveille, Thos. Corcoran, Manchester; Rev. D. W. Murphy, Dover.

NEW JERSEY.—John G. Shea, Elizabeth; Patrick Farrelly, Morristown; Rev. John Nolan, V. Rev. E. Helmstetter, Rev. J. A. O'Grady, Rev. J. M. Flynn, Rev. J. Toels, Rev. J. H. Hill, Rev. J. H. Brady, Rev. J. Brennan, Patrick Blewitt, T. Faughnan, Jas. G. McLaughlin, M. E. Condon, T. Kane, Dr. John B. Richmond, Newark; W. T. Ryan, Orange; John F. Prendergast, Salem; R. S. Pettit, C. P. Maloney, Atlantic City; Rev. W. J. McAdam, Lawrence Farrell, Trenton; Jacob Massner, Bridgetree; John J. Burleigh, Camden.

NEW YORK.—Geo. J. Schmitt, Count Loubat, Nugent Robinson, John D. Crimmins, Wm. H. Field, Eugene Kelly, John A. Mooney, Jos. J. O'Donoghue, Morgan J. O'Brien, L. H. Chapin, Jos. McGuire, Wm. R. Grace, Jas. S. Coleman, David McClure, Thos. F. Ryan, Aug. Walsh, Dr. John McCreery, John O'Brien, Richard H. Clarke, Jos. F. Carrigan, Francis Higgins, George B. Robinson, Jas. A. G. Beales, Robt. J. Hoguet, Henry L. Hoguet, Dr. Thos. A. Emmet, Hugh J. Grant, Dr. Chas. C. LeeFrederic R. Coudert, Judge O'Gorman, J. W. Wentworth, Chas. G. Hebermann, Duncan Harris, Scott Lord, Wm. P. O'Connor, Henry Amy, Chas. V. Fornes, John B. Manning, Z. J. Halpin, Jeremiah Fitzpatrick, Gen. John Newton, Jos F. Daly, Nicholas Benziger, Louis Benziger, P. O'Shea, L. Kehoe, Augustin Daly, L. B. Binsse, John G. Neeser, Adrian Iselin, Jr., Oliver P. Buell, Geo. Bliss, Jas. D. Lynch, Paul L. Théband, T. J. Glover, Jos. Dillon, John J. A Beckett, John Byrne, Jr., F. X. Sadlier, V. J. Dowling, P. J. Collier, V. Rev. Thos. J. Campbell, S. J., Rev. John Scully, S. J., Bro. Justin, Edw. F. Fagan, Thos. L. Kincade, Robt. McGinnis, Jr., John Burke, Wm. J. Fanning, John P. Brophy, Thos. F. Meehan, Xavier Roth, T. P. Galligan, M. F. Galligan, Jas. O'Tuell, Austin E. Ford, Robt. E. Ford, John H. Kelly, Eugene Kelly, Jr., Wm. Schickel, Edw. D. Farrell, Frank Ehret,

John B. Hasslocker, Peter Dorlger, Geo. B. Coleman, Bryan Lawrence, Wm. Solar, E. C. Donnelly, Patrick Meehan, D. R. Bend, Wm. L. Brown, Thos. S. Brennan, Chas. W. Sloane, G. P. H. McVhay, F. H. O'Neill, John C. Ryan, F. Elbe, John Hayes, R. J. Hoguet, Jr., H. S. Jenkins, John J. Reilly, Christopher Boilan, Daniel O'Leary, Thos. O. Agnew, Thos. Kelly, Eug. J. McEnroe, Dan'l Devlin, John J. Tardy, John H. Spellman, John R. Jameson, John D. Cummins, Jr., F. D. Hoyt, Rev. C. O'Keeffe, Rev. John Larkin, John O'Rourke, Thos. Mulcroy, Jas. A. Mulroy, J. B. Walker, Rev. John J. Kean, M. T. McMahon, Rev. J. B. Salter, Rev. Michael Nevin, Bro. James, Jas. Doherty, Terence J. Larkin, New York; Rev. P. W. Tandy, Sing Sing; James McMahon, John C. McGuire, Bernard J. York, Wm. G. Ross, John D. Carroll, Thos. F. Meehan, P. F. Keaney, Jas. H. Breen, Thos. Cassin, P. H. Goodwin, Robt. Myhan, Thos N. York, J. H. Farrell, Jas. White, Francis Curran, Rev. J. H. Hartnett, C. M. R. J. Dooley, Jos. T. Keiley, Dr. Geo. R. Kuber, John R. Kuber, Dr. Louis De B. Kuhn, John D. Keiley, Jr., Brooklyn; John A. O'Reilly, John G. Clifford, Rev. J. F. Mullaney, Syracuse; Francis Kernan, Nicholas E. Kernan, Utica, Chas. Tracey, John M. McCable, Rev. D. B. Collins, Peter J. Flinn, W. V. McKinley, Albany; Wm. O'Connor, Lansingburgh; John F. Dwyer, Miles McGrath, John O'Hara, Patrick N. Crowe, Michael C. Donlan, Amsterdam; Edm. O'Connor, P. Tighe, Dr. Mulheron, Binghamton; Thos. Sutherland, Troy; Rev. P. H. Barrett, Saratoga; John McManus, Jas. H. Dormer, Chas. Lautz, Jas. E. Nunan, John J. Hynes, Jos. Cameron, M. A. McHale, John Wimmer, Jos. Eberler, John A. Hippell, G. M. Zimmerman, John Streicker, Martin Avley, M. Noon, Caspar Drescher, D. McDonald, Thos. Gaskin, A. J. Röhmer, Simon J. Shien, Conrad Schirra, Richard Conklin, Jas. Finn, Martin Haley, Jacob Hiemenz, Matthias Rohr, Henry Lieder, John Moritz, John E. Zenner, John Riordan, F. J. Stephen, Julius Dietz, Aug. Hager, F. J. Riester, T. Gingras, J. A. Githre, Rev. P. Cronin, Dr. W. C. Callanan, Alph. Roehmer, Buffalo; Edw. Rogers, Daniel Rogers, Corning; John E. Dahoney, J. J. O'Connor, Elmira; P. J. Kelly, Salamanca; Thos. Gillyan, Edw. Bissett, Olean City; M. F. Bergin, Bergin; Michael E. McNally, Wellsville; Rev. P. V. Cavanaugh, C. M., Niagara; Rev. M. J. Keane, Hornellsville; John B. Riley, Rev. J. H. Conroy, Ogdensburg; Rev. T. Glenn, Watertown; John Neukirchen, F. J. Nugent, Andrew P. Schell, Rochester.

NORTH CAROLINA.—F. W. Kirchner, Rt. Rev. Leo Haid, O. S. B., Belmont.

OHIO.—Ph. B. Ewing, Edw. McGannon, H. A. Rheinhard, John A. Kuster, Luke G. Byrne, David McAlister, Edw. J. Manrath, Gil. B. Daugherty, Tall Slough, Columbus; John G. McDermott, Thos. J. McDermott, J. N. Steiner, Zanesville; R. E. Barron, Geo. W. Schachleiter, Ironton; M. A. Daugherty, Lancaster; Thos. Kane, Steubenville; Rev. L. Beek, Dayton; Donn Piatt, Mac-o-cheek; G. W. Schmitt, Adam Schmitt, Patrick Poland, Lawrence Poland, John H. Kohnescher, Matthew Cahill, Wm. Poland, Ferd. Marcelleff, T. J. Mulvihill, John Haggerty, J. M. Mulroy, F. A. Grene, Bruno Ritter, Daniel A. Rudd, Wm. S. Ervin, Wm. C. Walking, Thos. P. Hart, Rev. H. A. Schapman, S. J., John R. Rudd, Rev. R. H. Daees, Robt. Beatin, Cincinnati; Rev. Wm. McMahon, Martin Neuhäusel, Chas. J. Kirschner, John J. Vollmeyer, John Leahy, Edw. Dannermiller, Jos. Biechel, Jas. McHenry, Jas. Lavan, P. C. O'Brien, Luke Brennan, T. Smith, B. McCarthy, Wm. A. Manning, Cleveland; T. J. McDonnell, John L. Burns, Dr. J. T. Lawless, John Showell, Bernard H. Holtgriene, Toledo; Felix Shepley, Henry Falke, O. A. Trieber, Massillon; Rev. C. Trieber, Crestline; W. E. Mosher, Youngstown; Thos. McSheehy, Fremont; Otto Wagner, Herman Schieber, Tiffin; Nich. Porty, Fostoria; Wm. A. Lynch, Herman Kloherer, Canton.

OREGON.—Michael Munly, Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA.—F. W. Gunster, John E. Barrett, John F. Connolly, W. T. Holland, R. J. White, P. J. Kelly, Scranton; Rev. Peter C. Nagel, Wilkesbarre; Wm. McSherry, John H. Lowell, Harrisburg; S. M. Sener, Lancaster; Rev. J. J. Gormly, Renovo; S. J. Cordovi, Gettysburg; A. F. Keating; John D. Scully, Jere Dunlevy, Jr., Jas. D. Callery, Chas. F. McKenna, Jas. Phelan, Wm. Loeffler, J. B. Larkin, Wm. A. Golden, Albert J. Barr, C. G. Dixon, Jas. A. McNally, W. E. Lant, A. V. D. Watterson, Jas. Whelan, T. D. Casey, Jas. A. McCormick, Thos. A. Joyce, Jas. F. Wall, John C. Gray, Pittsburgh; Jas. Cullen, A. J. Anderson, Altoona; T. L. White, Jas. L. Deveney,

Joseph S. Skelly, McKeesport; Rev. Vincent Huber, O. S. B., Rev. Louis Haas, O. S. B., W. J. Head, Latrobe; B. J. Reid, Clarion; P. H. Cooney, T. S. Alberstadt, A. H. Blomer, Erie; C. B. Friedman, Titusville; Rev. Jas. Brennan, M. Kahl, Sharon; J. S. McGarry, Franklin; Stephen Farrelly, C. A. Hardy, M. F. Wilhere, Atlee Douredoure, Wm. J. Brennan, W. J. Power, Chas. McKeon, Jules Junker, E. J. Aledo, T. R. Elcock, F. T. Furey, P. J. Hoban, Thos. McFarland, John J. McVey, Thos. E. Mullan, Jas. F. Henry, P. Nungatroyde, F. A. Cunningham, Frank A. Foy, John H. Campbell, Jas. E. Dougherty, Hugh McCaffrey, Tim. H. Dale, John F. McGinley, Richard F. Currie, Owen Kelly, Phil. A. Nolan, Michael Murphy, Wm. A. Hayes, Peter Weber, Bro. Julian, Rev. Wm. Kieran, D.D., Rev. Jas. Daugherty, C. H. A. Esling, Chas. Walsh, M. I. J. Griffin, J. B. Colahan, Jas. J. Boyle, Jas. T. Furey, Wm. F. Harrity, N. J. Griffin, John A. Ward, Chas. H. Hard, John J. Boyle, D. C. Mulhearn, Philadelphia; Mgr. Thos. Brennan, D.D., Driftwood.

RHODE ISLAND.—Jos. D. Banigan, P. J. McCarthy, M. J. Harson, Eug. T. McAuliffe, W. J. Feeley, Jas. T. Kennedy, T. J. O'Neill, Providence; John Grant, Central Falls.

TENNESSEE.—M. Burns, Louis Ketterman, P. K. Carlin, John J. Shea, Nashville; M. Condon, F. J. Callan, Knoxville; Wm. Fitzgerald, Memphis.

TEXAS.—Thos. F. McEnnis, Dallas; J. H. Z. Scott, Dr. C. H. Wilkinson, Paul Shean, Galveston.

UTAH.—J. M. Gibbons, Ogden.

VERMONT.—Dr. John D. Hanrahan, Rutland; Rev. D. J. O'Sullivan, Burlington; Rev. J. A. Boissonnault, St. Johnsbury; Dr. V. Gosselin, Bellows Falls.

VIRGINIA.—Wm. Daffron, J. P. Coleman, Dr. John Mahoney, John R. Higgins, Wm. F. Reddy, John M. Finnegan, John H. Nagle, Wm. L. Finnegan, Dr. Daniel J. Coleman, John T. Delaney, Richard L. Carne, Patrick Keenan, John H. Dinnen, Richmond; Michael Glennon, M. Duggin, J. C. Carroll, Norfolk; Rev. J. T. O'Farrell, Petersburg; Jos. A. Parker, Portsmouth.

WEST VIRGINIA.—John E. Kenna, Thos. O'Brien, T. S. Riley, James Divine, M. J. O'Kane, Wm. S. Foose, Patrick Kennedy, P. J. Gavin, Jas. A. Filian, Jas. Wier, Patrick Weir, W. C. Handlon, John Waterhouse, Wm. Myles, T. W. Weitzel, P. J. Gillegan, John J. Reilly, John A. White, C. A. Wingerter, John J. Carroll, M. O'Neill, Wheeling; John T. McGraw, Grafton; D. H. Sullivan, Beall's Mills.

WISCONSIN.—John Lawler, Prairie du Chien; John Keough, Jas. Bardon, East Superior; Jas. Conroy, Milwaukee.

WYOMING.—A. C. Campbell, Cheyenne.

QUEBEC.—Rev. J. A. McCallen, Jas. A. Sadlier, Montreal; Honoré Mercier, Quebec.

NOVA SCOTIA.—M. J. Power, Halifax.

ONTARIO.—B. B. Hughes, Toronto; Rt. Rev. T. J. Dowling, Rev. J. J. Creven, Rev. John Connolly, Hamilton.

NEW BRUNSWICK.—Richard F. Quigley, Richard O'Brien, St. John; Rev. J. Carter, Petit Rocher; V. Rev. P. F. Barry, Bathurst.

ENGLAND.—Mgr. C. I. Gadd, Manchester; Rev. Jas. Nugent, Liverpool: Jas. Hennessy, London.

IRELAND.—Bro. E. A. O'Shanahan, Bro. C. D. Mehegan, Cork.

THE END.

Every Catholic Should Have a Copy.

The Souvenir Volume

OF THE

Centennial Celebration

AND

CATHOLIC CONGRESS

HAS BEEN PUBLISHED IN AN IMPERIAL QUARTO EDITION.

It makes a Handsome Volume

Of 160 pages, and is profusely illustrated with the portraits of the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States, the officers of the Congress, and the distinguished laymen who took part in its deliberations.

The work also contains a full account of the ceremonies attending the Centenary Celebration and the inauguration of the Catholic University, including the sermons of ARCHBISHOPS RYAN and IRELAND, BISHOPS GROSS, GILMOUR and O'FARRELL, and FATHER FIDELIS (JAMES KENT STONE).

It is without doubt the handsomest Catholic book ever published in this country.

Price, $2.50 per copy.

WILLIAM H. HUGHES, Publisher,
11 Rowland Street, Detroit, Mich.

CANVASSERS WANTED EVERYWHERE.

3117